Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/atonementforsins0000capt

"THE HIGHER CHRISTIAN LIFE"

SOURCES FOR THE STUDY OF THE HOLINESS, PENTECOSTAL, AND KESWICK MOVEMENTS

A forty-eight-volume facsimile series reprinting extremely rare documents for the study of nineteenth-century religious and social history, the rise of feminism, and the history of the Pentecostal and Charismatic movements

Edited by
Donald W. Dayton
Northern Baptist Theological Seminary

Advisory Editors
D. William Faupel, *Asbury Theological Seminary*
Cecil M. Robeck, Jr., *Fuller Theological Seminary*
Gerald T. Sheppard, *Union Theological Seminary*

A GARLAND SERIES

Russell Kelso Carter on "Faith Healing"

UNITED THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY

BT
732.5
.C37
1985

Garland Publishing, Inc.
New York & London
1985

For a complete list of the titles in this series
see the final pages of this volume.

The facsimile of *The Atonement for Sin and Sickness*
has been made from a copy in the Library of Congress;
that of *Faith Healing Reviewed*
is from the Drew University Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Carter, Russell Kelso, 1849–1928.
Russell Kelso Carter on "faith healing."

("The Higher Christian life")
Reprint (1st work). Originally published:
The atonement for sin and sickness.
Boston : Willard Tract Repository, 1884.
Reprint (2nd work). Originally published:
"Faith healing" reviewed after twenty years.
Boston : Christian Witness Co., 1897.
1. Spiritual healing. 2. Carter, Russell Kelso,
1849–1928. "Faith healing" reviewed after twenty years.
1985. I. Title. II. Series.
BT732.5.C37 1985 234'.13 85-4559
ISBN 0-8240-6409-7 (alk. paper)

The volumes in this series are printed on
acid-free, 250-year-life paper.

Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

The Atonement for Sin and Sickness

"Faith Healing" Reviewed
After Twenty Years

UNITED THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY

THE ATONEMENT

FOR

SIN AND SICKNESS;

OR,

A FULL SALVATION

FOR

SOUL AND BODY.

BY

CAPT. R. KELSO CARTER,

Author of "Pastor Blumhardt," "Miracles of Healing," "Supernatural Gifts of the Spirit," Etc., Etc.

THE SOUL.—"Who his own self bore our sins in his own body on the tree."—*1 Peter 2 : 24.*

THE BODY.—"Himself took our infirmities, and bore our sicknesses."—*Matt. 8 : 17.*

WILLARD TRACT REPOSITORY
BEACON HILL PLACE, BOSTON; 239 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK;
813 ARCH STREET, PHILADELPHIA.
1884.

Copyright 1884.
R. KELSO CARTER.

Philadelphia :
Press of Wm. Syckelmoore,
1420 Chestnut Street.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

My Confession, ... 1

Chapter I.—Pardon of Past Sin, ... 7

Chapter II.—Kept from Falling, ... 11

Chapter III.—Healing of Bodily Disease, . . 17

1. Sickness from the Devil, . . 70
2. The Importance of the Body, . 77
3. To the Law and to the Testimony, . 89
4. Who May be Healed? . . 95
5. The Sin Unto Death, . . . 104
6. The Perfect Means, . . 109

Chapter IV.—Kept from Sickness, . . . 116

Chapter V.—Objections and Questions, . . 121

1. The "Vile Body," . . . 121
2. Trophimus, . , . 122
3. Paul's Thorn, ... 124
4. The Man Born Blind, . . 133
5. Lazarus, ... 136
6. Death Appointed to All, . . 141
7. For the Apostolic Age, . . 143
8. The Days of Miracles have passed, 146
9. The Use of Means, . . . 147

Timothy and Wine. Hezekiah and Figs. Blind Man and Clay. Naaman and Jordan. Oil as a Medicine. John Wesley on Healing by Faith.

10. Who are the Elders? . . 159
11. Gifts of Healing, . . . 161
12. Casting out Devils, . . 169
13. Modern Thorns, . . . 171
14. Romanist Miracles, . . 176

PAGE

CHAPTER V.—15. Glorifying God in Sickness, . . 180
16. God's Will to Heal, . . . 190
17. That Review Article, . . . 193
18. Why not Instantaneous? . . 205
Miriam. Shunamite's Son. Hezekiah. Job. David. Blind Man, Clay and Pool. Nobleman's Son. Lazarus. Epaphroditus. Trophimus.

CHAPTER VI.—Full Salvation, ... 213

CHAPTER VII.—Review and Conclusions, . . 223

My Confession.

"In all thy ways acknowledge Him, and He shall direct thy paths."—Prov. iii. 6.

FOR several years, I have longed to write this little book. When I was led to surrender my whole soul and body into the Lord's hands, I found Him abundantly able to save to the uttermost. My God, for Christ's sake, forgave me all my sins, cleansed me from all unrighteousness, and healed my body of mortal disease, as related in the tract, Miracles of Healing. This was in September, 1879. As the months went by, a thought slowly formed itself in my mind. It seemed exceedingly radical; different from every idea and belief of my life; widely at variance with the doctrines of the Church, and, on the whole, rather a dangerous matter. But I could not get away from it; so I took it to the Lord, and earnestly prayed for His guidance, and for the light of the Word. The more I prayed and studied, the deeper became the conviction that the thing was of the Lord. At last, I ven-

tured to speak about it to a few friends, and together we talked it over, only to deepen the impression already formed. This thought was, that *the Church has been limiting the atonement of Jesus Christ.* Do not start, dear reader. There is no doctrine of Restitution hidden here. I believe that Jesus died only for the "Whosoever will." I began to believe that my Divine Master not only took upon himself my sins, but also bore my bodily sicknesses, and that I might, through simple faith, be free from the latter, just as well as from the former. To the man who believes that he must continue to sin as long as life lasts, there can be no parallelism of course; but, I had come to see that my Jesus is able and willing to save me from my sins, and was trusting Him for it. He had forgiven me my past offences, and He had healed my past sickness—heart disease. I was trusting Him to keep me from sinning; then why not trust Him to keep me from being sick, if Matt. viii. 17 and Psalm ciii. 3 have any present application?

The great question was, "Is it the truth?" How I prayed the dear Lord to keep me from error! There was not a single published word upon the subject, for the literature of faith-healing was confined to Dr. Cullis' first volume of "Faith Cures," and "Dorothea Trudel;" beside such more general works as Horace Bushnell's "Nature and

the Supernatural." I could not, therefore, get any help from man, and this fact threw me absolutely on God. I trusted in Him, and strove hard not to lean to my own understanding. But, in this way at least, I did not publicly acknowledge Him; that is I did not profess my faith on the subject. In the course of two years, however, I was led into a firm belief; and then the conviction grew upon me that I must make public confession. At this point the devil was ready. He said, "Now if you do profess such a thing, *even if it is true*, you will not have strong enough faith; you will get sick immediately; and bring the profession into disgrace, and yourself to confusion." I only prayed, O, Lord, make me sure of the truth, and I will confess it; I have nothing to do with consequences; that is Thy part.

Well, Jesus made me sure, and about two years ago I publicly announced my belief, in a meeting held in St. George's Hall, in Philadelphia. A very short time before this confession, the devil attacked me with severe griping pains and internal disorder. I resisted in faith, and called on my friend and brother in Christ, G. W. McCalla. He laid hands on me, anointing me with oil in the name of the Lord, we both claimed immediate deliverance from the threatened trouble, and the Lord entirely healed me. In order to prevent my profession of

faith, however, the devil referred to this attack. He argued in this wise. "It is true that you have not been sick of any account these two years and more; but you have had slight attacks of cold, etc. Now you had better not take such radical ground, for if you do you will be sure to catch a heavy cold,—you know you always have one or two in a winter, and thus you will get into trouble." I said, "Jesus has the keeping part, I have the believing and confessing."

So the Rubicon was crossed, and the declaration of my faith made public to a few. At that time I wanted to write something on the subject, but for various reasons it was not done. And now, after two years of trusting and keeping, I begin to write down what God has done for my soul and body. Meanwhile several have spoken and written this very item of faith—the keeping power of Jesus to save from bodily sickness; but it is a matter of regret that some of these have been led into the mistake of disregarding all natural laws, maintaining that a man need scarcely sleep or eat, if the work of the Lord presses upon him; but that God is bound to take care of him through any amount of physical exertion. This I apprehend to be a grave error. Moses and Elijah fasted forty days and nights, but in each case a special, clear, and unmistakeable manifestation of God's hand and

will made the way plain before them. If the Lord wants me to work for days without natural rest, He will make the duty plain by *supernatural* indications. When He does so, I will work, and trust Him for the consequences.

I now gladly testify that the dear Lord has kept me, these two years, free from sickness of the body. Even the severe colds, which the winter always brought, have not appeared. The devil has tried hard, several times, to make me sick; preliminary symptoms have been felt, and the matter of becoming ill was made a literal temptation to me. But every time the Lord Jesus has stood with me; I simply told Him He must save me; and it was done. The symptoms did not develop, but disappeared. A little hoarseness struggled along for a few days, serving as an *opportunity for faith*, and that was all.

This then is my confession. I believe that Jesus "bare my sins—all of them—in his own body on the tree;" and I believe that "he took my infirmities, and bore my sicknesses." Now if He bore them for me, I am not obliged to carry them myself; so I just believe it, and cry, from my inmost being, Praise the Lord! Of course, I know that I am professing faith in an item of experience which can not be hidden from the eyes of those about me. A man may sin and feel con-

demned in his own heart, and no one know anything about it; but he can not be seriously ill without the fact becoming apparent. All this I have counted. That is I have counted it all over into the hands of my Savior and Physician. I have nothing to do with the future; I live by present breath for the body, and present faith for the soul. But I do boldly avow my belief that *Sin and Sickness are from the devil; while Holiness and Health are from God.* If I sin, it is because the devil gets the advantage in my soul, and if I am sick, it is because he gets the advantage in my body. In neither case does any necessity exist. In the following pages will be found the reasons for the faith that is in me. Praise the Lord!

This little book, the writing of which has been singularly blessed to my own soul and body, is now committed to the work which the dear Jesus, who gave it to me, has for it to do. And to His name be all the praise!

PENNSYLVANIA MILITARY ACADEMY,
March, 1884.

CHAPTER I.

Pardon of Past Sin.

"Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness." 1 Pet. ii. 24.

IT is hardly necessary to attempt to show that the Atonement was intended to cover committed sin. This little book is written primarily for Christians, and of course there is not a Christian on the face of the earth who does not believe that the death of our Lord provides a full and free pardon for all our past sins, and all our past unrighteousness. Nevertheless it may be well to quote Scripture on this point, that the whole argument may be presented together.

"Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification."—Rom. iv. 25.

"For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the *remission of sins that are past*, through the forbearance of God."—Rom. iii. 23–25.

"By him all that believe are justified from all things."—Acts xiii. 39.

"All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all."—Isa. liii. 6.

"Thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea."—Micah vii. 19.

"I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins."—Isa. xliii. 25.

"I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions, and as a cloud, thy sins; return unto me; for I have redeemed thee."—Isa. xliv. 22.

"He made intercession for the transgressors."—Isa. liii. 12.

"Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all his benefits: who forgiveth all thine iniquities."—Ps. ciii. 2, 3.

"And he shall redeem Israel from all his iniquities."—Ps. cxxx. 8.

Of course we could consume hours in simply reading the Scriptures upon this point. Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners; and every Christian believes, if he believes at all, that the Atonement covers all his past sins and all his past unrighteousness, up to the present moment. He who does not believe this, directly confesses that he would be lost if he should instantly die. The pardon of past sin is, of necessity, the first boon to the sinner. He feels condemned; his offences are like mill-stones about his neck, and he cries unto God for release from the death sentence, which he can feel hanging over his head. Having obtained pardon, the soul feels justified by faith,

and has peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Christ becomes the Elder Brother, and "Our Father" rises to the lips, and thus, Adoption is realized.

Many Christians live for years on the very first round of the ladder. They have received pardon for past offences, and nothing more. They do not feel fully justified up to the present moment; have very little peace, and do not dare to declare their adoption into the family of the Lord. Are you a Christian? is answered with evident reluctance by the hesitating, "I hope so." But all such are fully aware of their privilege and duty in the premises. They know that they ought to have peace, to feel sure of their pardon, and to know the family to which they belong well enough to declare their relationship without any misgivings. This full experience and faith constitute justification.

Just here I call special attention to the fact that justification, in the very nature of the case and of the word, has reference only to the past. Even Dr. Charles Hodge frankly acknowledges the "apparent solecism" in speaking of the pardon or justification of future sins. To most men's minds such language is an actual solecism. My own common sense tells me that I can not be pardoned today for sins that will be committed to-morrow. The Romanist buys an "indulgence" for future sin; but even the daring presumption of a John Tetzel never ventured to call these licenses by the name of pardon. And I most earnestly maintain that the man who teaches that, at conversion, the

soul is justified from all the sins of the past, and from all the sins of the future, is just as much preaching an indulgence for sin, as ever did the famous monk of Reformation times. Hear Ezekiel:

"But when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live? All this righteousness that he hath done shall not be mentioned: in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die."—Ezek. xviii. 24.

"The righteousness of the righteous shall not deliver him in the day of his transgression; neither shall the righteous be able to live for his righteousness in the day that he sinneth."—Ezek. xxxiii. 12.

The Church needs a radical reformation to-day on this point. There are too many indulgences sold. The successors of John Tetzel proclaim to-day you can not live without sin; therefore the Atonement pardons you in advance for the unavoidable transgressions of the morrow. Ezekiel is not read, and a false theology paralyzes the activities of many souls. My brother, realize the truth. Pardon refers to the past. Justification establishes your present standing, not your future actions. Jesus Christ grants no indulgences for sin. But learn that there is a wider and deeper experience than this. Something more is included in the Atonement. Open your eyes; reach forth your hands; go boldly on, and you shall obtain.

CHAPTER II.

KEPT FROM FALLING.

"Unto him who is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our Savior, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen."—Jude 25.

THERE are many precious promises of Scripture given to "him that overcometh," and every true Christian struggles manfully to overcome sin, both outward and inward. We are told by the large majority of the Church, that it is possible to get the victory over all outward transgressions, so that we will give no visible display of anger, resentment, malice, envy or uncharitableness; that this can be accomplished through the agencies of constant prayer and unceasing watchfulness; but that we can not hope to avoid all inward sin, much less to be free from the taint of the natural heart. Dr. Charles Hodge, representing the more rigid school, assures us that an "advanced Christian" will find himself "sinning, even daily, in thought, word and deed." Mr. Moody may be cited as the leading representative of a school who believe that God's grace is sufficient for all trials and temptations, and that by this grace we can have the victory always in thought, word and deed; but that this is always

a victory over a real enemy who dwells *within* the soul to the very hour of death. In other words, this latter theory does not accept the entire extermination of the inbeing of sin, but maintains that the roots are still within the heart, and require the most constant repression to prevent sprouting.

It may be said that this last is surely all that is necessary, since it certainly embraces the idea of being actually "kept from falling." Undoubtedly it is much superior to the others; but I maintain that even this theory *positively limits the Atonement of Christ.* The Wesleyan theory, however, presents as possible, to every believer who will fill the conditions of absolute consecration, unhesitating faith, and constant confession, an experience of Christ's saving power, deep enough to root up every trace of inbred depravity, and to utterly exterminate the inbeing of sin. In this experience there is a war it is true, an unremitting conflict with the power of darkness; but it is a battle in which, like God's people of old, we "stand still and see the salvation of the Lord." We "do not need to fight in this battle," but simply trust Jesus to do it all for us. We "shout for the Lord *hath given* us the city," and do not lift a finger in the struggle, except in the exercise of our faith in the perfect work of Jesus.

There is a very important element of faith and of doctrine contained in this last idea of the Atonement, which is practically wanting in each of the others. Only in the Wesleyan view of the matter is the Atonement believed to be *instantaneous* in its

application to unrighteousness, or inward depravity. Even the Moody theory, grand as it is, looks upon the Atonement as incapable of relieving the soul from the load of inherited evil disposition until the very hour of death. Perhaps the word "incapable" would be rejected; but it does not alter the sense in the least to say that the Atonement was not designed to cleanse the soul completely before the hour and article of death. The practical result to the experience of the soul is that Jesus' sacrifice *can not* remove the troublesome roots of sin.

Now this little book is founded entirely upon the grand central truth, that ample provision was made upon Calvary for the actual and practical destruction of the works of the devil—sin and sickness. When Jesus cried

"IT IS FINISHED"

He expressed this fundamental fact. He came to "destroy the works of the devil;" and when He said that mission was accomplished, I propose to believe Him. I am not shutting my eyes to the fact that death is a work of the devil. Undoubtedly it is, but we have this provided for in Scripture, and are told that "death the last enemy *shall be* destroyed." I read in Revelation that in the eternal city there shall be no sorrow or sighing, no tears or tribulation, and no night; but I do not read that there shall be no sin or sickness. Now if it be a fact that we must sin and sicken up to the moment of our entrance into glory, why did not the Rev-

elator mention the new and wondrous experience of the glorified saints in heaven? He thought it worth while to write down the exemption from sorrow and tears. Ah! John remembered the words of Jesus, "In the world ye shall have tribulation;" "Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your *reward in heaven*." John knew well that no saint would ever be free from these things, while in the flesh, and so he pictures the delights of the holy city when "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain;* for the former things are passed away." And he it was who wrote, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin," for "if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another; and the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin." He, of all others, clearly taught that the Christian should be entirely free from sin, in this life; and therefore he did not mention the exemption from sin in heaven, for this would be nothing new to the soul that is completely washed in the blood. It may be suggested

* This word, in the original, is *ponos*. The primary meaning of this word, as given by Robinson, by Pickering and others, is, *work, labor, toil, travail, etc.* The secondary meaning may be pain, but more in the sense of distress, trouble, misery, injustice, etc. The word is derived, by Robinson, from *peno*. It is thus abundantly proven that the idea of disease is not suggested at all.

that the absence of temptation in the new Jerusalem is not specified either. To this I reply that, where there is no sorrow, no crying, no tears, no death and no devil, there could not be any temptation. Of course a perfectly pure heart could not be tempted from the inside; temptation must come from without, as in the case of Eve; and when "death, the last enemy" has been destroyed, and Satan eternally consigned to his prison home, manifestly there could be no temptation. It goes without saying. Besides, we may easily claim that "sorrow, crying, tears," etc., obviously include the idea of temptation; for what Christian does not know, that a sorrow, which does not present the *temptation* to doubt God in some way, is not worthy of the name?

I have thus briefly defined the true doctrine of the Atonement for the soul. It embraces pardon from past sins, and past uncleanness; and cleansing from all traces of inherited depravity, as well as the keeping power against sin in any form, outward or inward. The Atonement of Jesus Christ is a finished sacrifice, once for all, for my sins of commission, and for my inbred sins; and of course provides for a maintenance of cleanness in my soul. As this is the familiar branch of the subject, I will not write more upon it: but will refer the reader to such works as Wesley's sermon on Perfection; his plain account of Christian Perfection; Bishop Foster's Christian Purity; Geo. D. Watson's Holiness Manual; the first Epistle general of John, and St. Paul's letter to the Hebrews. The latter is

a regular, systematic treatise on the doctrine of Entire Sanctification, and anyone who reads it honestly, before God, will surely find "the way into the holiest." Praise the Lord!

CHAPTER III.

Healing of Bodily Disease.

"Who healeth ALL thy diseases."—Ps. ciii. 3.

BY the grace of God I expect to show that the Atonement has provided for the body all that it has provided for the soul. As this is a feature of Christ's sacrifice which has been largely buried beneath a mass of skepticism, doubts, unbelief, and forgetfulness, it will require much more space than has been devoted to the preceding chapters.

Of course every true christian readily admits that God can cure bodily sickness; and that He has often done so, and done it in answer to prayer. There are few families in the land who can not point to some incident of this kind. A dear one had come nigh unto death; physician's skill was exhausted, and no hope remained. But in their extremity they called upon God, and suddenly the symptoms changed, and the patient recovered. A single example will suffice. The young son of a Methodist minister was slowly but surely choking to death with membranous croup. The father gathered together several brother ministers, and together they kneeled about the bed and besought God to spare the child. While they thus prayed,

a spasm of coughing siezed him, a hard mass of phlegm was dislodged, and the boy recovered. This was many years ago: and he is still living. Of such a case as this the doubter exclaims—"Why he was going to cough anyhow, and the result was merely a happy accident;" but the Christian readily yields the glory to God. Everyone knows that such occurrences as this are without number in the history of the Christian Church.

Now I wish to call special attention to the fact that such a case can never be cited as an illustration of the special power of God, without the fear of contradiction, based upon apparent reason. The unbeliever, either in or out of the church, says that we cannot possibly prove any interference with the laws of nature. The physician was on hand, and his medicine had been administered. The very tendency of these remedies was to clear out the throat; and when this very result was accomplished, why not credit it to the physician? Even in the case of a remarkable physical transformation, as the straightening of a curved spine, the same reasoning prevails; for have not physicans often succeeded in such cases? The devout Christian is perfectly willing to concede that God did the work potentially, and that the patient would have died without the divine interference; but he believes that it was done through the legitimate channels of the means used by the nurse and physician.

With none of these theories and beliefs have we anything whatever to do. The position to be stated and sustained in this chapter, is that *God*

now heals bodily sickness, precisely as He now heals soul sickness, by His power alone, unaided by any means whatever; and that He does it through and by virtue of the perfect Atonement of Jesus Christ.

I do not propose to burden this little work with numerous instances of healing. Any one who is skeptical is referred to "Pastor Blumhardt," "Faith Cures," "The Great Physician," "Dorothea Trudel," "Healing of Sickness by Scriptural Means," "Prayer of Faith," etc., all of which can be obtained from the Willard Tract Repositories in Boston, New York or Philadelphia. I can never speak or write upon this subject however, without giving my personal testimony. Three able physicians in Baltimore, and two in Philadelphia, agreed in pronouncing my trouble to be heart disease, and incurable; although they all hoped to benefit me. In this respect however they all failed. After seven years of sickness I consecrated all to God, believed His word, called upon His servant, Dr. Chas. Cullis, and was prayed with according to James v. 14, 15, with the laying on of hands and the anointing with oil in the name of the Lord. From that day to this—four years and a half—I have never touched any form of medicine or remedy. Praise the dear Lord alone! I am well. I do more work than I ever did before, look to Him alone for strength and health, and He never leaves me nor forsakes me. For full particulars of my case, see Miracles of Healing. Of course I understand that the doubter will say that there is no absolute proof of miraculous intervention. While it is true the

doctors can not get the glory, yet my imagination, force of will, etc., did the thing for me ; and probably the doctors were mistaken in their diagnosis, as they often are.

For the benefit of such minds I record here a few instances of healing in which all the *known* laws of nature, applicable in the premises, were set at nought. Miss Ruth S. King, of Rahway, N. J., thus relates her wonderful experience:

"For over twenty years I have been losing my hearing, seldom hearing a whole sermon, and very little of ordinary conversation, compelled to guess at most of the answers of my Sunday-school class of young ladies. Oh, how I panted for nearer communion with Christ! During the past year I have 'hungered and thirsted after righteousness,' looking for the fulfillment of the promise. I attended Dr. Cullis' Faith convention at Old Orchard Beach, Me., July 24, 1883. On my arrival I found my hearing much worse, and wished that I had remained at home. Mrs. Hannah W. Smith, a few days after, gave a Bible reading on the promises. I felt that I could claim them all, as unspeakably precious. In my room that night I was enabled to make a complete consecration, as I had never done before. The following day I claimed, on my knees, that glorious promise.—(James v: 14, 15.) When Dr. Cullis prayed with and anointed me, I felt the power of the Holy Spirit like a great wave of peace, from the crown of my head to the soles of my feet. It was indescribable. I walked a short distance to the grove ; Rev. Dr. Steele was preach-

ing; his voice seemed loud and clear to me. I was afterwards told that he spoke in an ordinary tone of voice. Then I began to praise the Lord for my hearing, when my ears itched intensely, followed by a cracking sound, and as if something were shoved aside, and oh, how I heard! as I never did in my life. 'Bless the Lord, oh, my soul!' When the speaker raised his voice, it was like a trumpet and painful to me. With a joyful heart I hastened to tell my friends how the Lord had healed me. That night, in my room, I could do nothing but praise Him. The last five psalms helped me to express my joy, especially for the great Baptism of the Spirit that was given to me; *then* I realized the *fulfillment* of the promise I had clung to so long. The following morning the passing of the early market wagons awakened me; the room being dark, I could scarcely convince myself that they were not in the room. Then I thought, the Lord gave me my hearing yesterday. I was overwhelmed with a sense of His love and goodness. I had prayed to be healed to glorify Him in working for Him. Oh, how wondrously He blessed me! My ears for six weeks were very sensitive to loud, harsh sounds, a proof of the entire healing. Everything sounded so dull before. I can now, not only hear the sweet carols of the birds, but oh, I can hear the glorious gospel! As a thank-offering to my dear Saviour, I send you this statement, hoping it may encourage some afflicted one to trust in 'Jehovah-Rophi.' RUTH S. KING." *

* From *Triumphs of Faith.*

I myself saw and conversed with this lady immediately after her restoration, and personally heard the testimony of her friends as to her previous condition.

For those who ask for still more convincing evi dence of modern miracles of healing, I suggest the careful reading of the case of a broken arm, restored in a single night, recorded in "The Great Physician and Dorothea Trudel," and of the numerous cases found in the "Life of Pastor Blumhardt."* These will suffice. I unhesitatingly assert that the evidence for the miraculous healing of disease through faith in Jesus, is every whit as clear and undeniable, as is the evidence of the conversion of any soul in the last eighteen hundred years. How do you come to believe that a soul is truly converted? By the profession of faith in Jesus, and by the visible change in the outward life. How do you know that a sick body has been healed by the power of Jesus? By the evident change in the physical life, and by the profession of faith in the Healer. *The evidence is precisely the same.* "One thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see," is a kind of testimony that never has been and never can be successfully answered. The Lord takes care to provide such overwhelming manifestations of His power that even the "magicians can not do so with their enchantments." † In our day, however, men, and

* See the case of Rebecca Fravel in the note on another page.

† The wonderful manifestations of strange mesmeric power, shown by Miss Hurst, Miss Price, and Mrs. Coleman, of Georgia, will surely be used by skeptics to prove that God is not so wonderful after all.

Christians even, have found a way of "withstanding," that exceeds Jannes and Jambres themselves. They refuse to accept the more ordinary testimonies of healing, attributing the results to the power of will and imagination.* They incredulously ask for absolute physical evidence, such as the reuniting of a broken limb, but when this is given, as above, the prompt reply is a flat "I don't believe it."

This is the root of the whole opposition—unbelief. The absolute tendency of the natural heart is to oppose God at any and every possible point. This is the real secret of the partial acceptance of the wretched and absurd theory of evolution by so many Christians. A so-called natural cause is assigned for a result, previously accredited to the miraculous power of God. In fact it may be safely asserted that the leading tendency of the world to-day, is to minify God's power. We are living in an age when it is fashionable and popular to favor any *anti-miraculous* theory that can possibly be trumped up. The devil has forced upon the world a pet phrase, until it has become a proverb: *The days of miracles have passed.* And most people regard this proverb as much more authentic than any old King Solomon ever wrote. We find recorded in the sayings of the wise man, such as these: "My son, attend to my words: . . . . For they are life unto those that find them, and health to all their flesh."—Prov. iv. 20, 22. "For

* The new school of "mind physicians" in Boston, and elsewhere, are already referred to by Christians as proof that healing is only the result of mental power.

by me thy days shall be multiplied, and the years of thy life shall be increased."—Prov. ix. 11. "Why shouldest thou die before thy time?"—Eccles. vii. 17. But the number who are willing to take God's word at its face value, without any discount, is exceedingly small. A man, who calls himself a minister of the gospel, recently stated in his pulpit that "nobody nowadays, *except the unintelligent*, thinks of believing the Bible to be an inspired book."

> "Men don't believe in a devil now,
> As their fathers used to do;
> They've forced the door of the broadest creed,
> To let his majesty through."

expresses the sentiment of a large portion of the "intelligent" church goers of our day. Truly the tree of knowledge has always proved a dangerous possession.

In face of all this skepticism, however, there are many Christians who will freely admit that God has done many wonderful things in answer to prayer, and that the like may be expected to occur again. But they assure us that such cases are sporadic, and do not afford the least foundation for the belief in a general theory of healing through faith. They even seek to explain these events by the supposed operations of certain natural laws.

Now let us honestly consider this matter of seeking to explain miracles. I do not hesitate to pronounce any such attempt as radically wrong, and as very dangerous to the spirit of childlike faith, without which, Jesus said, we cannot enter

the kingdom. When the late General O. M. Mitchell delivered his eloquent astronomical lectures throughout the country, he sought to present a possible scientific theory for the miracle of the sun's stoppage at the command of Joshua. He showed that it could have been done without arresting the revolution of the earth, by simply condensing the atmosphere, and thereby vastly increasing its refractive powers. I do not wholly condemn such a theoretical explanation, but on the contrary, heartily approve of it, *provided* it is used in its legitimate place. The only real use for any of these so-called reconciliations of science and Scripture, is to prepare the way in the natural heart of an *unbeliever* for the faith that must follow. Most men stumble over their heads with such persistency that they must be knocked down, like Paul, upon their own chosen pathway, and positively stricken blind or dumb, before they can receive the simple truth. But the moment any soul that has been to the fountain of cleansing for the pardon of sin, and has been adopted into the family of God, seeks to find a more intimate knowledge of God, and to see more of His deep things, all such "explanations" must be thrown away. "The entrance of thy word giveth light," is the only efficacious recipe. *A "son of God," must be content to take his Father's word, without any endorsement.* *

* When a Christian reads such grand "explanations" as Prof. Vail's "Annular Theory of the Creation and Deluge," and receives therefrom new ideas of God's wonderful power and perfectly harmonious work; all is well.

It is entirely possible and even extremely probable, that all the miracles of the Bible were performed by God, through laws just as absolute and infallible as the attraction of gravitation itself. I have no doubt whatever that, if the Lord saw fit to explain to me just how He severed the lower waters of the Jordan from those that came down from above, I would understand it just as clearly and as scientifically as I do the statement that, "the Lord caused the Red Sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night." Divine wisdom saw fit to tell us the *modus operandi* of this miracle, but not of the other. When Henry Varley went into Captain Black's cabin and, kneeling down with him and his officers, prayed God to stop the terrible cyclone, which threatened them with speedy death; who could have imagined any natural law, by which the natural results of those terrific waves could be averted? Yet, while he prayed, a mighty hail-storm beat the dashing billows as smooth as though they were covered with oil, and the terrible wind fell calm. Even so, I believe that the opening of the deaf ears, the raising of the dead, the healing of the broken arm, and all the list of miraculous works of God are certainly and clearly explicable by natural laws, and that there is no such thing in God's universe as the temporary abolition of His established principles. In order to stop those waves God did not annihilate the laws of momentum and inertia, but actually used these very principles to accomplish the result. Left to themselves those waves would have contin-

ued to break long enough to demolish the vessel; but Omnipotence used the momentum of the frozen hail to check the momentum of the liquid water. God can insert an unseen key in the great clock of the stars and wheel them backwards in their orbits, as easily as I can in the same manner, reverse the hands of my watch. The natural law of gravity ordains that the boat shall float with the stream, but the natural law of the steam's expansive force propels the vessel in the opposite direction. The natural law of motion insists that a body shall move in a straight line, yet the natural law of the peculiar twists imparted to the base-ball, actually causes it to curve, first to the right and then to the left; and for a similar reason the twisting rifle-ball turns from its proper course. Every time a bird flies, an animal moves, or a piece of machinery is put in motion, we have before our eyes just as much a "violation" of natural law, as when God's hand parted the crystal gates of the sea for the marching hosts of Israel. In other words, *we see an example of one natural law dominating another.*

But, all this being admitted, I still insist that any attempt at an explanation of a miracle, which God has not seen fit to explain, is dangerous to an advancing faith. We should of course settle the great fact that "all things are possible with God," but it is not necessary to stumble over apparent or imaginary contradictions in order to reach a little of the "all things possible to him that believeth." We are to believe God blindly it is true—that is

faith—but we are not required to believe unreasonably. I am asked, how can the Lord heal a fatal case of sickness without flying in the face of law? I answer, how could he stop a cyclone? My belief thus becomes perfectly reasonable, while it is perfectly blind, *as all absolute faith must be.* Nicodemus has an enormous family, who are always betraying their descent by the question, "How can these things be?" When the doubting ministers said, "How can we hope to accomplish anything in India" the soldier Duke of Wellington, replied, "That is none of your business. You have your marching orders, 'Go ye into all the world, and preach my gospel to every creature.' You have nothing to do with the results; obey your orders." Nicodemus was not an infidel, but a godly man; and whenever the true Christian asks Nicodemus' question after God's word, he is sure to miss the power of that word.

Many a Christian almost indignantly resents the imputation that he does not believe God just as much as any other man; but of course his belief is absolutely governed by his light. If I say to him, I believe what God says; he responds, So do I. But when I adduce certain promises of Scripture for faith healing, he immediately insists upon confining them to the Apostolic age, or gives them a forced spiritual interpretation, entirely at variance with the plain sense of the language. Yet he says he believes God just as much as I do. Manifestly, if I am right, he does not believe as much as I, but stops short at the limit of the light he has received.

I always praise the Lord for that word of Holy Writ, "Knowing this first that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man (no prophecy ever came by the will of man, Rev. Ver.): but holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Pet. i. 20, 21.

We thus come face to face with those words of power and executive ability first recorded in Gen. i. 3. "God said." When Jesus was tempted of the devil, his only answer was, "It is written," and so Paul only gives us a single weapon of offense—"the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." We need various pieces of armour for defense; the helmet, shield, and breast-plate; but when we seek to advance from one battle-field to another, when we sally forth to win a new victory over the foe, we need a sword, and that sword is always the same that formed from chaos the rolling worlds—"God said." This "Word was in the beginning with God, and the word was God," and "in Him was light and the light was the life of men." This is the Word whose "entrance giveth light." Let us always remember the simple recipe for faith—"Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." Rom. x. 17.

We now come, in logical sequence, to the question, what hath God said on the subject of healing bodily disease? Let it be borne in mind that I am not writing this chapter merely to prove that some people have been healed, but to show that

the Atonement of Jesus Christ actually embraced sickness as well as sin: in short, that God is ready to heal any disease through faith, just as He heals sin through faith.

In Isaiah liii. 4 we read, "Surely He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." It can not be questioned that this statement is just as clear, comprehensive, and emphatic as, "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities." In fact, were I disposed to stickle for a mere grammatical construction, I might claim that the former is the stronger of the two. It is a fact that the church has commonly read this verse as if the words "griefs" and "sorrows" have reference to afflictions of the mind and spirit; and few have ever gone farther than to believe that they might apply to the comforting and sustaining grace given in bodily sickness. It may therefore be a matter of surprise to many devout Christians to be told that neither of these words has reference to spiritual matters, but to bodily sickness alone. One of the ablest Hebraists of our country recently sent me this translation, without having an idea of the use to which it was to be put.

> "Surely our sicknesses hath he taken upon him, (lifteth up, as a load,) and our sorrows, he hath carried them."

Albert Barnes says of this verse, "In the 53d chapter of Isaiah is fully stated the doctrine of the Atonement, or that the Messiah was to suffer for sin. In the verse quoted (Matt. viii. 17; Isa liii. 4), he states the very truth which Matthew declares.

The word translated *griefs* in Isaiah, and *infirmities* in Matthew, means, properly, in the Hebrew and Greek, *diseases of the body*. In neither does it refer to the diseases of the mind, or to sin. To bear those *griefs*, is clearly to bear them *away*, or remove them.

"'*Our Sorrows*.' Perhaps the proper difference between this word and the word translated *griefs* is, that this refers to the pains of the *mind*, that of the *body*; this to anguish, anxiety, or trouble of the soul, that to bodily infirmity and disease. * * The phrase therefore properly seems to mean that He took upon himself the mental sorrows of men. He not only took their disease and bore them away, but He also took or bore their mental griefs. That is, He subjected Himself to the kind of mental sorrow which was needful in order to remove them."

Archbishop Magee, in his great work on "The Atonement," assigns the same meanings to the words, and quotes many Scripture verses where the same original Hebrew word is so translated. The reader is referred to any standard commentary for additional testimony upon this point. But a still better authority remains. In Matt. viii. 16, 17, we read, "He healed *all* that were sick: That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses." Here we have an inspired commentator, plainly declaring that the verse has reference only to bodily ailments. We ought to render special praise to Jesus for this di-

vine interpretation, for without it there might be some show of reason in the opposition to the doctrine herein set forth. These able scholars agree with Matthew that Jesus actually lifted up, as a load which we could not carry, our diseases and pains of body and mind. Barnes says: "*bore them away.*" The clear meaning is, that Jesus did take upon Himself our diseases and our mental troubles, in precisely the same way that he "bore our sins in his own body on the tree."

But this fourth verse is only a portion of the evidence found in this wonderful chapter. We find the word "grief," in verses 3, 4, and 10. In each case the real meaning is *sickness* or bodily pain. The learned translator, Dr. Robert Young, in his version of the Bible, thus renders these verses:

3. "He is despised, and left of men,
A man of pains (Heb. Makob), and acquainted
with sickness (*Choli*),
And as one hiding the face from us,
He is despised, and we esteemed him not.

4. "Surely our sicknesses (*choli*) he hath borne,
And our pains (*makob*) he hath carried them,
And we—we have esteemed him plagued,
Smitten of God and afflicted.

5. "And he is pierced for our transgressions,
Bruised for our iniquities.
The chastisement of our peace is on him,
And by his bruise there is healing to us.

6. "All of us like sheep have wandered,
Each to his own way we have turned,
And Jehovah hath caused to meet on him,
The punishment of us all.

* * * * * *

10. "And Jehovah hath delighted to bruise him
He hath made him sick (chalah).
If his soul doth make an offering for guilt,
He seeth seed—he prolongeth days.

* * * * * *

12. * * "With transgressors he was numbered,
And he the sin of many hath borne,
And for transgressors he intercedeth."

There is no escaping the force of this accurate translation. Dr. Young was not laboring to prove a doctrine of faith-healing, but he more than confirms Albert Barnes in the quotation from the latter, just given. The word *makob*, rendered *sorrows* in verses 3 and 4, means *pains*. But, as Barnes says, it seems to refer to "anguish, anxiety, trouble of soul," or to mental pain. But the words *choli* and *chalah*, mean respectively, *sickness*, *weakness*, *pain*, and, *to make sick*. Verse 3 is very strong. In it the prophet distinctly states that Jesus Christ was "*a man of pains, and acquainted with sickness.*" No Christian living would object to the idea that He was a man of pains (mental sorrows), in that He actually suffered and endured the pangs of anguish or sorrow, even to a much greater extent than we ever knew. When "He sweat as it were great drops of blood," did He not bear and feel the real weight of deadly sorrow? Of course no one will think of objecting to this. But the rest of the verse just as distinctly avers that He was "acquainted with sickness." As long as the word in English is put "grief," the ordinary reader is not mystified, and passes on; but the scholar finds reason for reflection. When, however, we see that

the real meaning is "*sickness*, *weakness*, *pain*," and not grief at all, in its ordinary sense; even the common mind will naturally ask, what does this mean? I reply that if the first part of the line means that Jesus endured mental sorrow, the latter part means that He actually experienced the pangs of sickness. If this is not true, then there is no use for God to tell us anything in language for we can not possibly believe him to mean what He says.

Many devout hearts will be horrified to think that Christ was ever sick. But let us look upon it. Certain it is that Jesus never knew the *inner principle of disease* within the system, any more than He was ever actually poisoned with the indwelling *principle* of sin. There is no Scripture to warrant for a moment the thought that sin ever resided in the Son of God as a *root* or inward fountain of pollution. He was so absolutely pure and perfect that there was no place or spot wherein sin could find a lodgement for an instant. Just so no disease could ever lurk within His body. Notwithstanding all this, Jesus certainly did bear our sins. He certainly did feel and know the *power* of sin, and endure the essence of its consequences and penalties; and there is precisely the same language to warrant our belief that He also felt and endured the pangs or pains of sickness. The Apostle tells us "He was made sin for us, who knew no sin," and the Prophet says that Jehovah "hath made him sick." Peter writes: "Who his own self bore our sins in his own body on the tree," and Isaiah de-

clares, "Surely our sicknesses he hath borne, and our pains—he hath carried them."

Again, what are the punishments of sin? All will admit that sin is punished by soul-condemnation, remorse, mental anxiety, and frequently by sickness. Now of course Jesus took upon Himself the condemnation, anxiety, and mental and moral anguish. All admit this, and believe that these punishments are at once remitted the moment we are pardoned, and that they are remitted because of the vicarious Atonement. Then by what rule of Scripture or of reason is the last mentioned punishment severed from the rest? Mark the Prophet's words. "Jehovah hath caused to meet on him *the punishment* of us all." Now confessedly, sickness is part of that punishment. Hence it is demonstrated, by the immutable Word, that sickness is included in the vicarious Atonement.

It may be claimed that sickness cannot be included, because it is under "natural law." It is surely about time for Christians to learn that "natural law" is God's law. Now what law can be cited, in the realm of physics, which is more universal and more inexorable, than that which declares that sin will surely cause anguish, anxiety, remorse and soul sickness? Is not this law just as truly "natural" as that which governs bodily disease? And if God chooses to cancel the sin and remove its mental effects, by grace through faith; what Christian will dare say that He can not just as easily remove the sickness? Is it true that God will always, and *at once*, give deliverance from

every penalty and consequence of sin, except one? and that this one must inevitably remain to the bitter end? Away with such a thought! Isaiah affirms that the entire punishment of us all was caused to meet on Him. Oh! glory to His name! He testified "It is finished." There was nothing incomplete about the work of our mighty Jesus.

We might follow every verse in this remarkable chapter with profit. "He is pierced for our transgressions." What does that mean? Of course that Jesus bore the penalty of our offences, so that we do not have to bear it. But is the language a whit clearer than "Himself bore our sicknesses?" "The chastisement of our peace is upon Him," is surely not quite so plain as "by His bruise there is healing for us. "He was numbered with the transgressors" gives light to many a despairing sinner; but is it more explicit than, "He hath made him sick?" Surely, nothing but the blindest prejudice can close the eyes, in the light of these facts, to the great truth that sickness is included in the vicarious Atonement, every whit as emphatically as sin, in this great proof chapter of Isaiah.

It may be well to caution the reader against any such blunder as that perpetrated by a prominent divine when he recently wrote very slightingly of an attempt to prove faith-healing by means of Isaiah liii. Let every one remember that this wonderful chapter is the very pith and marrow of the Old Testament proof for the vicarious sufferings of our Lord, and has been so regarded by the church in all ages. It is a chapter which, of all others, most

troubles the Jew and delights the Christian. Albert Barnes certainly did not seek to prove faith-healing when he said, "In the 53d chapter of Isaiah is *fully stated* the doctrine of the atonement." And again he said, speaking of the phrase "bore our sicknesses,"—"To bear these 'griefs,' is clearly to *bear them away, or to remove them.*" Yet he had just affirmed that the word "griefs" meant only "disease of the body," and did not refer at all to the mind. One thing I fearlessly maintain, that if the Atonement for sickness is not taught in this chapter, then the Atonement for sin cannot be found in it. I praise the dear Lord, it is all there! A perfect work; embracing mental pains and physical disease for the body; and transgressions and inbred iniquity for the soul.

Now, why did He thus bear our sicknesses? Was it for His own chastisement, reproof or correction? Did He *need* to bear the load of disease any more than the load of sin? Then, why did He do it? We have the fact that He did bear both. Why was it? Everyone must admit that 1 Pet. ii. 24 and Matt. viii. 17 are equally plain and positive; and the candid mind must be struck with the close analogy between them. But Peter gives us the reason for sin-bearing—"that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness." That is, that we, being free from the necessity, as well as the guilt of sin, should live in soul health. Is it then stepping beyond the plain rules of analogy to say that Jesus bore our sicknesses that we, being dead to disease, should live unto bodily health?

Does not Matthew say as much? He tells us that Jesus "healed all that were sick" in order to fulfill the Scripture which of all others plainly speaks of the Atonement. Paul says, in Eph. v. 23, "He is the Saviour of the body," * and we all believe that the complete fullness of salvation will never be realized until that wonderful day, when the reunited soul and body shall be glorified with Him at his appearing. The man who believes that the soul can never be free from sin in this life is entirely consistent in believing that there is no such thing as exemption from sickness of the body. But he who finds in Jesus the perfect cleansing of the soul, and the keeping power against all sin, can be equally consistent in placing his body beneath the same wonderful salvation.

In this connection it is a remarkable fact, that no one has been known to seek the healing power for the body, without receiving a distinct spiritual baptism; and further, that everyone known to the writer (a very large number), who has been *entirely healed* in body, is or has become a believer in and professor of entire sanctification of soul. For over four years I have closely and constantly studied this subject, and observed a very large number of cases. It has often appeared that, after the first joyful experience of the healing power and the accompanying baptism of the Spirit, the Lord has evidently striven to lead the awakened soul into that absolute self-surrender which brings

* This word is used 135 times in the New Testament, and in nearly every instance refers to the physical body.

the full revelation of a whole Saviour. But this leading has been resisted. The individual has drawn back, and said, I cannot do this, I cannot go there, I will not believe God wants me to be willing to act thus and so. At once the healing power of the body has been arrested, and very often a speedy relapse, either in whole or in part, has followed. This is the plain secret of a great many apparent failures in faith-healing. If I start out to take Jesus Christ for a whole Saviour, there must be no possible reservation. I must be willing to *confess* and to *profess, to be, to do, or to suffer* anything, anywhere, in any way whatever, without a particle of hesitation.

It is noticeable that a text which is often quoted for the soul, "This is the will of God, even your sanctification,"—1 Thess. iv. 3, has no reference to spiritual matters, but to those bodily sins which, of all others, most frequently induce severe bodily disease.* This closely agrees with the old promise to Israel, "If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments, and keep all his statutes, I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have

* If a text be desired that expresses God's will for sanctification from all sin, take Heb. x. 9, 10: "Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. . . . By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." There can be no doubt in this case as to the application of the word. The whole Epistle to the Hebrews is, in fact, a clear, consecutive treatise and argument on entire sanctification.

brought upon the Egyptians. For I am the Lord that healeth thee (or the Lord, thy healer)."—Ex. xv. 26. Here we see, distinctly joined together, the entire consecration and devotion of soul, with the health of body. What could be plainer? So we find God speaking frequently to His people:—"I will take sickness away from the midst of thee."—Ex. xxiii. 25. "The Lord will take away from thee all sickness."—Deut. vii. 15. "I make alive . . . and I heal."—Deut. xxxii. 39. That these promises were literally fulfilled, we have the word of the Psalmist, who tells us of the wandering people of God: "There was not one feeble (sick) person among their tribes."—Ps. cv. 37. "He sent His word, and healed them."—Ps. cvii. 20. When they sinned, sickness came. When they repented, sickness departed.

The narration of the wanderings furnishes us with some marked illustrations of this close parallel. The wonderful promise just quoted from Exodus xv. 26, was given immediately after the wonderful deliverance at the Red Sea. At Sinai they greatly sinned, and were plagued accordingly; but were healed in answer to the prayer of Moses. Again, they lusted for flesh, and pestilence fell upon them. Miriam sinned and was stricken with leprosy, only to be healed through prayer. In the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters of Numbers we have a most significant history. The people had come to Kadesh-barnea, the spies went out and returned with an evil report. The nation believed the skeptics and doubted God, and as a consequence were con-

demned to wander and die in the wilderness, while the plague destroyed the fearful spies. Then follows that marvellous dramatic picture in Numbers 16th, when Korah and his followers sank into the earth, and Aaron stood "between the dead and the living," with swinging censer, obeying Moses' order to "*make an atonement*" for the congregation; "*and the plague was stayed.*" In Numbers xxi. we have the story of the Brazen Serpent. The people sick and dying with bodily pains, were told to look and live. Here we have the Atonement most strongly and beautifully set forth. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must I be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in me, should not perish but have everlasting life." These were types to be sure; but were they only types, and nothing more?

But there are many other texts upon which to base this glorious doctrine. Let those who object that a "single Old Testament prophecy quoted in the New" is the only foundation, carefully note the following:

1. "Honor thy father and thy mother, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee; that thy *days may be prolonged*, and that it may go well with thee, in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee."—Deut. v. 16. "The first commandment with promise," promises what? Simply physical life as a consequence of obeying God in honoring our parents. But physical life and our experience "in the land" are under the "natural laws." Here then in the decalogue itself we find

the fundamental truth that God will physically preserve the *obedient*. I praise the dear Lord for this grand evidence that the remission of sickness was included in His plan. The *only* commandment that carries a distinct promise, assures us that life and prosperity alike are from God alone.

2. Deut. v. 33: "Ye shall walk in all the ways which the Lord your God hath commanded you, *that ye may live*, and that it may be well with you, and that ye may *prolong your days* in the land which ye shall possess." See also Deut. iv. 40; xii. 25, 28; xxii. 7. Eph. vi. 3. After reading all these texts we certainly see that physical life was most emphatically promised to God's obedient children. Much could be said upon this, but we pass on.

3. Deut. vii. 12–15. "Wherefore it shall come to pass, *if ye hearken* to these judgments and keep and do them, that the Lord thy God shall keep unto thee the covenant and the mercy which he swore unto thy fathers: And he will love thee, and bless thee, and multiply thee; he will also bless the fruit of thy womb, and the fruit of thy land, thy corn, and thy wine, and thine oil, the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep, in the land which he sware unto thy fathers to give thee, * * there shall not be male or female barren among you, or among your cattle. And the *Lord* will take away from thee *all sickness*, and will put none of the evil diseases of Egypt, which thou knowest, upon thee; but will lay them upon all them that hate thee."

Here we have a general collection of physical benefits to be directly conferred by the Lord. Surely barrenness, corn, wine, oil and the increase of flocks are all under "natural laws"; yet here we find them placed absolutely *under the great law* of love and obedience. The fifteenth verse is specially conclusive. "The Lord shall take away from thee all sickness." Could anything be plainer than that? It is absolutely certain that the Israelites had a *law* of entire exemption from sickness. But God is the same to-day; and *the only ground for any benefit to fallen man lies in the Atonement of Jesus Christ.*

4. Deut. xxviii. 15–61. "If thou wilt not hearken," etc., ... "the Lord will make thy plagues wonderful, and the plagues of thy seed, even great plagues and of long continuance and *sore sickness* and of long continuance. Moreover he will bring upon thee all the diseases of Egypt which thou wast afraid of; and they shall cleave unto thee. Also *every sickness*, and every plague, which is not written in the book of this law, them will the Lord bring (*cause to ascend*: margin. Query. Ascend from the pit of hell?) upon thee until thou be destroyed." See entire chapter, as also xxix. 22–24. These lengthy declarations of the great Jewish lawgiver are certainly conclusive. Again and again was the plain law of physical health laid down; and the language admits of no alteration, or turning from the literal sense. If they served God, He would by His power keep off the *evil* diseases of every kind, whether named or not. If

they served Satan and the flesh, He would "cause" sickness "to ascend" upon them. The great trouble to-day is that so many people believe we have a different God, and that the great *principles* of His government passed out of use with the Mosaic ritual. This law of health was not ritualistic, it was a *fundamental principle* based upon the eternal equity of an unchangeable God. And He who "hath reserved better things for us," is "the same yesterday, to-day and forever." This entire charge from the lips of Moses, is wonderfully forcible and clear upon the point that God meant to take care of the body as well as the soul.

5. 2 Chron. vii. 12-14. "And the Lord appeared to Solomon by night, and said unto him, I have heard thy prayer, and have chosen this place to myself for an house of sacrifice. If I shut up heaven that there be no rain; or if I command the locusts to devour the land, or if I send pestilence among my people. If *my people which are called by my name* shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will *forgive their sin*, and will heal their land." Two things in this gracious promise suggest the words of James. The assurance is given to "my people," just as the Apostle says "any among you" (the believers in the "twelve tribes scattered abroad"); and the connection between the healing and the forgiveness of sin. "I will forgive their sin, and will heal their land," is exactly parallel to "the Lord shall

raise him up, and if he have committed sins they shall be forgiven him." The forgiveness of sin turns solely upon the Atonement, and here the inference is very plain, that the sickness should be removed in the same way and for the same reason that the sin was forgiven. The condition prefixed makes this still more forcible. "If my people . . . . shall humble themselves and pray and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways." Now we know that when a man humbles himself, turns from his sins and seeks God's face, he is forgiven. But how? Solely through the merits of the vicarious Atonement. But here we see the same conditions set for bodily healing. How irresistible then the conclusion that bodily healing was based upon the same wonderful sacrifice!

6. The 33d chapter of Job is very strong and clear, but as it is referred to elsewhere, we will omit an analysis here.

7. David knew a great deal about faith-healing. Hear a few of his utterances upon the subject. Ps. vi. 2, "Have mercy upon me, O Lord; for I am weak: O Lord, heal me; for my bones are vexed." Verse 5 shows that he spoke of physical trouble. "For in death there is no remembrance of thee: in the grave who shall give thee thanks?" Then in verse 9 he gives this experience. "The Lord hath heard my supplication; the Lord will receive my prayer." Again in Ps. xli. 2. "The Lord will strengthen him (he that considereth the poor;) thou wilt make all his bed in his sickness." In Ps. lxxviii. 20-22, we find the idea suggested that God

expects us to use the means, and only the means, which He has commanded. Moses smote the rock when God said "speak ye to the rock," and David declares, "therefore the Lord was wroth . . . because they believed not in God, and trusted not in his salvation." The best medicine I can use is the simple word in Jas. v. 14, 15; and when I do as God commands, I trust only in His salvation and best honor him. As Dorothea Trudel so beautifully wrote: "we honor God most by believing His word."

8. Ps. xci.; What Christian does not love to read this magnificent poem? But how many Christians dare to believe it? I declare my firm conviction that no honest man can sit down and study this psalm in the light of what we have already considered, asking himself honestly the question, what does it really mean? without being satisfied that he has not realized the literalness of God's salvation as fully as he ought. I give Young's translation in full; but do not fail, dear reader, to compare the regular version with it.

1. "He who is dwelling
In the secret place of the Most High,
In the shade of the Mighty lodgeth habitually,

2. "He is saying of Jehovah,
My refuge and my bulwark, my God, I trust
in Him,

3. "For He delivereth thee from the snare of a fowler,
From a calamitous pestilence.

4. "With His pinion He covereth thee over,
And under His wings thou dost trust,
A shield and a buckler is His truth.

5. "Thou art not afraid of fear by night,
Of arrow that flieth by day,

6. "Of pestilence in thick darkness that walketh,
Of destruction that destroyeth at noon,

7. "There fall at thy side a thousand,
And a myriad at thy right hand,
Unto thee it cometh not nigh.

8. "But with thine eyes thou lookest,
And the reward of the wicked thou seest,

9. "(For thou, O Jehovah, art my refuge,)
The Most High thou makest thy habitation.

10. "Evil happeneth not unto thee,
And a plague cometh not near thy tent,

11. "For his messengers He chargeth for thee,
To keep thee in all thy ways,

12. "On the hands they bear thee up,
Lest thou smite against a stone thy foot.

13. "On lion and asp thou treadest,
Thou trampest young lion and dragon.

14. "Because in Me he hath delighted,
I also deliver him—I set him on high,
Because He hath known My name.

15. "He doth call Me, and I answer him,
I am with him in distress,
I deliver him, and honor him.

16. "With length of days I satisfy him,
And I cause him to look on my salvation."

Now in the light of reason and common sense, what did the Psalmist mean by all this? When we read "A shield and buckler is his truth," we say, certainly, we believe that. "Thou art not afraid of fear by night;" we believe that. "Of pestilence," or "a plague cometh not near thy tent;" well, that

is a *figure of speech*. Is this the way to read God's Word! What can be said of "With length of days I satisfy him, and I cause him to look on my salvation?" The last part is not a figure; then is the first? We might very profitably discuss the entire psalm, one verse at a time; but I do not wish to do more than bring clearly before the mind the great fact that this glorious psalm distinctly promises physical health and immunity from sickness to—and here is the great point—the man who "is dwelling in the secret place of the Most High, in the shade of the Mighty *lodgeth habitually*." These wonderful promises then are to him who is always dwelling and always abiding in Christ, or "under the shadow of the Most High." Just here we see the weakness of the devil's famous quotation of Scripture to the tempted Saviour. "He will give his angels charge concerning *thee*, and in their hands they shall bear *thee* up lest thou dash thy foot against a stone." Who is the "thee" referred to? He who *abideth continually* in God. If any man ventures to disregard all the laws of God concerning health and safety, expecting to be kept from injury, he is guilty of gross presumption, and does exactly what Satan tempted Jesus to do. The moment anyone presumes upon a promise of God, that moment he steps out from the "shadow of the Most High," and the 91st Psalm is not for him. So we must be exceedingly careful not to let an excess of zeal persuade us to act in defiance of the laws of a well proportioned physical endurance. There are times and seasons when God lays extra-

ordinary work upon His servants, but in such cases extraordinary strength is granted, and the Spirit makes the necessity very clear. Moses fasted forty days upon two occasions, and Philip was caught away from the Eunuch, while Elijah "girded up his loins and ran before Ahab" to the gate of Samaria. But these are rare exceptions, and must be left entirely in the sphere of the special guidance of the Spirit—a sphere at once the most delicate and dangerous to ambitiously explore,—*or criticise.*

9. Ps. ciii. 1–5. The third verse is best rendered as in Young,

> "Who is forgiving all thine iniquities,
> Who is healing all thy diseases."

David calls upon his soul to bless the Lord, because He forgiveth all his iniquities. How does God forgive sin? Of course, through the Atonement of Jesus Christ. But the Psalmist, in the same breath, blesses God because He heals all his diseases. How does God heal sickness? O, by the skill of human physicians! A perfectly candid mind must allow that there is not the least *a priori* evidence in the text for any such conclusion. On the contrary, the whole weight of evidence clusters about the clear parallelism—iniquities and diseases, all healed by Jehovah. No man, without the natural prejudices of education, would dream of calling in an agent in one case, any more than the other. If God forgives the iniquities, then God heals the diseases. The only agent needed is the blood of Christ.

10. Ps. cvii. This entire psalm may be read with profit. The head lines declare that it speaks of "God's providences over travellers, over captives, over sick men, over seamen, and in divers varieties of life." In verse 6, we read of the travellers "Then they cried unto the Lord in their trouble, and he delivered them out of their distresses." In verse 13, we read precisely the same words of the captives. In v. 28, the same words speak of the deliverance of seamen. Now surely all these are literal and not figures of speech. But v. 19 gives exactly the same deliverance to the sick. As if this were not enough the Psalmist adds another assurance, not given to traveller, captive or sailor. In these cases the deliverance is declared, but the manner of that deliverance is not specified. When he speaks of the sick, however, the method and means of healing are distinctly pointed out. "*He sent his word and healed them*, and delivered them from their destruction." Praise the Lord! for this straightforward statement. The traveller is "led forth"; the captive "brought out"; the seamen "brought unto the haven", but not a word is said of the means employed. But when the sick are "saved out of their distresses," then we have the way set forth. "He sent his word and healed them." How well this accords with the declaration of *John* of the Eternal Word, that "In him was life; and the life was the light of men." Jno. i. 4. Again we read, "And this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life." 1 John v. 11, 12. All agree that Jesus will give life to the body

eventually, but fail to see the privilege of present life in the sense of health.

This psalm enforces another point. "Fools because of their transgressions, and because of their iniquities, are afflicted." What plainer statement could we have that sickness is a consequence of sin in some form? This being so apparent, how can we fail to grasp the comforting promise that if these same "fools" "cry unto God" even from "the gates of death," "he saveth them out of their distresses"? And this is followed directly by the declaration that the healing comes by "His Word."

11. David's son seemed to have an idea that there is health in the Word, for he wrote, "My son, attend to my words; incline thine ear unto my sayings. Let them not depart from thine eyes; keep them in the midst of thine heart. For they are *life* unto those that find them, and *health to all their flesh*."—Prov. iv. 20–22. In chap. iii. 7, 8, he says, "Fear the Lord, and depart from evil. It shall be health to thy navel, and marrow to thy bones." The two words rendered *health* are given in the margin, *medicine*. Dr. Young gives *healing*. The idea is evidently expressed by the words restorative, remedy, healing, medicine. The wise man wrote again, "In the way of righteousness is life."—Chap. xii. 28.

In quoting such verses as this last I do not mean to argue that physical life alone is meant, but that it is certainly included in the text. "The fear of the Lord is a fountain of life, to depart from the snares of death."—Chap. xiv. 27. "When a man's

ways please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him."—Chap. xvi. 17. Is not disease, as the work of the devil, an enemy? If I am sick I am at once certain that either some action, word or thought, or some failure to see the Spirit's leadings does not "please the Lord." "Wisdom giveth life to them that have it."—Ec. vii. 12. "Why shouldest thou die before thy time?"—vs. 17. Evidently Solomon believed it possible for life to be lengthened by conformity to the will of God.

12. Jeremiah prayed, "Heal me, O Lord, and I shall be healed; save me and I shall be saved."—xvii. 14. Here again we see the health of soul and body coupled together, and the true power of restoration attributed to God alone.

13. Ezek. xxxiv. 4, 16. "The diseased have ye (the shepherds) not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick," etc. . . . . "I will strengthen that which was sick." The whole chapter is weighted with reproof to the shepherds of Israel for neglecting their duty. When we read, "neither have ye sought that which was lost." . . . . . "I will seek for that which was lost," we assent at once to its plain meaning; but when we read of healing the sick we begin to think of "figures of speech." When, however, we remember Jesus' commission to the twelve and to the seventy—"preach the gospel and heal the sick," we see that the old prophet may have been more literal than we have been educated to believe. Possibly the modern shepherds have missed a great blessing in not claiming and enjoying the privilege

granted in James v. 14, 15, to the "elders of the church." I say nothing of possible reproof. In all love I say to the shepherds, brothers do not imagine that all these reproofs and terrible threatenings of Ezekiel, Zechariah and other prophets, were meant only for the possible priests of a period in Jewish history not thoroughly understood. Are you leading the sheep in the best possible pastures, are you preaching a *full* gospel? Are you afraid Jesus Christ may become a little too supernatural, and get a little too much glory? Are you fearful that the discoveries, skill and science of man may not be sufficiently honored? Are you ready to be "little children" before the Lord? O divine Master! let Thy truth enter and give light!

14. The first temptation presented to Jesus in the wilderness was a purely physical one. There is a deep and powerful significance here. Many suppose that the devil was not sure of the divinity of Christ. Be this as it may, he was sure that Jesus had a man's body and a man's physical nature; and long experience had confirmed him in the belief that a man can be approached most easily through the body. This Man had fasted forty days, and was hungry. Satan knew the almost resistless power of awakened appetite and physical desire, and so he suggested the immediate provision for a natural want. But the temptation aimed at another thing. The possible doubt as to the identity of Jesus led to the keen insinuation upon that point; or if this be not true, the sneering tempter reminded Him of omnipotent power.

I incline to the former belief. There is too much credit given to the devil entirely. What better advantage could he ask than to have men endow him with transcendent powers? He likes to wield the lash of a master, and if he can get a soul to believe it to be impossible to fight against him, his battle is already won. He always turns away people's minds from that declaration "Resist the devil and he will flee from you;" and whispers, you cannot hope to fight against him; he was next to God in heaven, and his power is almost unlimited. So it comes about that men are willing to ascribe a slightly limited omnipotence and omniscience to Satan. Nearly everybody supposes him to possess foreknowledge, and even gives him credit for having an intimate acquaintance with God's plans and purposes. Dear reader, this is all manufactured in hell. Are we to suppose that He, before whom archangels veil their faces, is visible to the personification of sin? Are God's ways which "the angels desire to look into" open reading to the prince of darkness? Will God who allows glimpses into the future to come now and then to His most favored servants, give foreknowledge freely to His greatest enemy? Depend upon it Satan only knows the future as revealed in prophecy. Undoubtedly he may often interpret it better than man; but he knows nothing to come, of himself. He cannot tell the destiny of a single soul till God declares it; hence his unremitting war to the last. His hope of success endures to the very gates of death, and he never spares an

effort. What he most likes to hide from us to-day is that *he is a beaten foe.* Christ overcame him, defeated him, whipped him at every point; and Christ is ready to give the same victory to the true believer. Oh! how Satan dreads the discovery of this great secret! how carefully he guards against it, and how he howls with disappointment and rage, when a soul perceives it, through faith in the blood.

But to return. Satan presented his first temptation to the worn out physical powers of Jesus. It was a literal trial. "If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread." (*Even the devil admits that the miracle of creation demonstrates God.* Let infidelity profit by his example.) But he evidently based his hope of success upon the weak body which was calling loudly for food. To this literal, physical temptation Jesus replied "It is written, man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Matt. iv. 4. See Deut. viii. 3. Moses told Israel that God fed them on manna in order to make them know that man should live upon the words of God, as well as upon his natural food. The devil desisted at once, and tried another spot in the armor. As Judge Lowe has beautifully said, "'It is written' was enough for the devil, and only the devil will ever say it is not enough."

I feel that I am treading upon holy and delicate ground. Yet I am persuaded that Jesus' words did not want in literal signification. I remember

Elijah in his forty days' march across the desert "*to* Horeb, the mount of God." I recall Moses, as for nearly three months he abode in God's presence. The scene in the wilderness of the Jordan rises before me, and another scene as well. Upon a silent mountain top a man *continues* all night in prayer to God. In the early morning watch, in the strength which came not from physical food, but from conversation with His Father, He walks upon the tossing sea (the great symbol of the surging sin of our souls), calms the tempest, *not by slow methods of gradual subsidence,* but by a word; and when He reaches the other shore, so strong is the life within Him that "as many as touch the hem of His garment are made perfectly whole." Matt. xiv. 36. "The water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." Jno. iv. 14.

With loving gratitude I testify for Jesus in this matter. More and more I am coming to realize that my whole life, physical as well as spiritual, hangs upon the Word of God. "His words are sweet to my taste," and "I esteemed the words of his mouth more than my necessary food," have a significance beneath the "figure of speech." I know that "the life which I now live *in the flesh* I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me." Jesus brought my soul out of the pit of sin. Jesus brought my body out of the pit of fatal disease. Jesus keeps my soul, and Jesus keeps my body. These have become great, thrilling facts in my experience. Again and

again, when weary and tired with physical work, I have found rest and strength in the "words of His mouth," and been more refreshed than if I had eaten or slept. A few minutes on my knees, alone with God, have given me more actual physical strength, not to mention spiritual vigor, than hours of idleness. I do not mean to say that we are to disregard all the laws of nature and press beyond the bounds of reason. Quite the reverse. I speak of times when work was to be done, which, while trying, was not at all unreasonable. I do not throw away my reason, but only make it dependent upon, and co-laborer with faith. Many an outbreaking, God-defying sinner endures much more physical effort every day than I do, or ever did. That is not the point. The distinction lies in this. I was prostrated through disease. Jesus restored me. But now my physical nature and experience often demonstrate, to my entire satisfaction, that, but for the living Word, I would not be alive, much less in health and comfort. I am made to feel vividly my constant dependence upon Jesus, and am always conscious that every breath I draw for body, soul or spirit, comes straight from His hand. I am thus sweetly aware that I belong entirely to my Savior, and I praise Him for all I am, and all I have. Praise the Lord!

One thing is certain. Jesus met a temptation which involved the question of physical life and health, by the positive statement that these do not depend upon the human means of sustenance alone, but upon the Word of God. To contend that He

referred only to spiritual comfort would be to say that the Son of God used Scripture where it was not applicable. This would be blasphemy.

15. The commission to the twelve apostles is significant. Matt. x: "He gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease." After conferring this power,* He said: "as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand. Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils; freely ye have received, freely give." Mark vi. 12, 13, tells us: "And they went out, and preached that men should repent. And cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them." We are not told that they secured many converts, but are assured of the success attending their healing ministry. See Luke ix. 1, 2, 6. "He gave them power and authority over all devils and to cure diseases. And he sent them to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick. And they departed, and went through the towns, *preaching* the Gospel, and *healing* everywhere." Again in Luke x. 1, 9, 17, 18, 19, we read: "The Lord appointed other seventy also, and sent them two and two before his face . . . and said unto them . . . into whatsoever city ye enter . . . heal the sick that are therein, and say unto them, The Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. And the seventy returned again with joy, saying, Lord, even the devils are subject unto

* How did they know they had the power? I imagine only because Jesus said so.

us through thy name. And he said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven. Behold I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing shall by any means hurt you."

These quotations prove, that Jesus gave his first preachers a double commission, for souls and bodies. They prove that these diseases, or at least some of them, were the direct work of the devil. They prove that all such power is "through thy name," the name of Jesus; which is simply another way of saying that the *benefits of such power rest solely upon the vicarious Atonement.* And they prove that to these first teachers He also promised a continuance of health in their own persons; even in spite of "serpents," "scorpions" and all the power of the enemy." The inference is not unreasonable, that the poison from a serpent's bite, in its operation upon the human body, belongs to the "power of the enemy," "he that hath the power of death," —the devil.

16. I here trespass a little upon the following chapter, because of the connection. In Mark xvi. 17, 18, we read, "And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." In this last utterance to His disciples Jesus promised all these signs "to them that believe." I elsewhere discuss the absurdity of the argument which predi-

cates anything upon the fact that these signs have not followed good Christian men and women, who had no belief in or expectation of these signs. But here is the promise. Notice that it includes the assurance of personal *exemption* from physical injury, as well as the extension of benefits to others. Upon what could these benefits be based, save upon the atonement? No twist of the language can possibly alter the plain fact that Jesus directly promised miraculous preservation, and miraculous powers to "them that believe." * When the apostles felt the need of "power from on high," they deliberately united in asking God to stretch forth His hands to heal, "and that signs and wonders may be done by the name of thy holy child Jesus."—Acts iv. 29, 30. Note that this prayer was offered in an age of faith in the supernatural and amongst a people whose whole history abounded in the miraculous. Is there less need to-day, when we are surrounded by a materialism in the world and *in the church*, which holds that God has not stepped outside the barrier of "natural law" for centuries, and that He cannot or will not do so?

17. 1 Cor. vi. 13. "The body is . . . for the Lord; and the Lord for the body." That Paul here speaks of the physical body there is absolutely no question. How is the body "for the Lord?" Of course to serve Him. But how is

* For conclusive evidence of the existence of everyone of these signs in modern times, see "Supernatural Gifts of the Spirit."

the Lord for the body," except to save it and preserve it? This will prove a difficult question to answer in any other way. And how can the Lord save any part or portion of a man, except through the Atonement? I pass the 12th Chap. of 1 Cor. because of its use elsewhere. We may well read it in this connection however, and remember that "all the promises of God *in him* are yea, and in him Amen, unto the glory of God by us."—2 Cor. i. 20. "We walk by faith, not by sight," 2 Cor. v. 7, was written just in the midst of a pointed discussion of the physical body. Read it and ponder. Eph. v. 23, 30: "He is the savior of the body. For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." Well may Paul add, "This is a great mystery." Thank God! many mysteries become plain when we are walking with Jesus. Even this is not wholly a blank. This wonderful union with Christ; just what is its nature and how it is brought about; who can tell? But may we not believe in the union itself as an actual fact, and not merely a figure? "Members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." The life of Jesus in me, coursing through my veins, and thrilling my soul and spirit; how can it be mine, save through the merits of His atoning sacrifice? "He that eateth me, even he shall live by me."—Jno. vi. 57. "Doth this offend you," beloved? Beware how you ask "How can this man give us his flesh to eat"? The answer will only be the yet stranger statement, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye

have no life in you." Remember, "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, *dwelleth in me and I in him.*" I do not attempt to explain, but can only say these words have a meaning now to me that is new and strange and wonderful.

18. Gal. iii. 13. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." This is a tremendous assertion, and it clearly involves the vicarious Atonement for sickness or disease. These afflictions are indisputably the attendants and results of sin. That they are emphatically included in the "curse of the law," can not be denied for a moment. Refer again to the numerous quotations already made from Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, etc., for the repeated and lengthy declarations of Moses upon this point. In fact there is vastly greater evidence that sickness and disease constituted the "curse of the law" than that spiritual death was indicated. This may appear startling, but it is most positively true. Of course I do not for a moment belittle the spiritual side of the question, but I do point to the fact that the "law" most specially and repeatedly declares bodily sickness to be directly included in the "curse," and to form a very important element thereof. But Paul positively affirms that "*Christ* HATH *redeemed us from the curse of the law*," the whole of it, of course, for who will dare say the work of redemption is not finished. But how hath He redeemed us? By "*being made a curse for us.*" Let us put this argument in its simplest form.

1. All forms of sickness and disease were included, and *even mentioned particularly*, in the "curse of the law."—Ex. xv.; Ex. xxiii.; Lev. xxvi.; Deut. vii.; Deut. xxxii., etc., etc.

2. "Christ *hath* redeemed us from the curse of the law." Therefore, Christ *hath* redeemed us from all sickness and disease. There is no future tense about it, the work is finished. Again,

1. Christ redeemed us from sin by His vicarious Atonement; that is, "He was made sin for us."

2. Christ redeemed us from the "curse of the law," by "being made a curse for us."

Therefore we are redeemed from all the "curse of the law," body, soul and spirit; solely through His vicarious Atonement. Praise the Lord!

Search the Scriptures, and see whether these things be so.

One single case will be quoted here from Scripture. In Heb. xi. 11, we are distinctly informed that it was "through faith" that Sara received the healing from a purely physical deficiency, and that it was "because *she* judged him faithful who had promised." Plainly, her faith was necessary, and was exercised before the healing came. And just here let me praise the dear Lord for His goodness to me, although I be called a fool for so doing. While writing these pages to-night (Feb. 26, 1884) my little girl, aged sixteen months began to cry. She had been suffering somewhat with her teeth during the day, and the throbbing pain prevented her sleeping. I considered it an attempt of the

devil to cheat me out of the time given to the Lord, and so I tried to soothe her and inwardly prayed. The thought came to me that I ought to anoint her and claim the specific promise. I did so, and in the name of Jesus commanded the pain to depart. Immediately I left her in the Lord's hands and went down stairs, not stopping to attempt to soothe her, or to induce her to sleep. In a few minutes there was a single cry, and then she rested as quietly as ever. A baby's imagination could hardly allay the pain of swollen gums; but Jesus is willing and ready to take little children in His arms, and His touch carries healing to-day, as well as in the past. Praise the Lord!

As we read the life of Christ, we are struck with the continued stream of healing miracles that flowed from him wherever He went. "He healed *all* that were sick." "As many as touched were made perfectly whole." This record begins with his ministry, and terminates in Gethsemane with the act of healing power in restoring the ear of the high priest's servant. When the great prophet, Elisha, was laid to rest, the dead bones of a man sprang into life at the touch of his body; but when Jesus died *many* graves opened, and the risen dead walked the streets of Jerusalem. Truly the Atonement made provision for the body.

But it is contended that these numerous miracles of healing were wrought in order to establish the divinity of our Lord. Now, it is true Jesus himself said that His works testified of the Father, and at another time, He exhorted His hearers to "believe

Him for the very work's sake." But surely the latter clearly hints at the fact that such was not the primary intention. "I work the works of Him that sent me," gives us the idea that Jesus *continuously* bore the sins and sickness of lost souls and bodies. He said not "I have worked;" that would admit the construction of an intended demonstration of His divinity; but "I work," is present and unlimited. Let us remember in this connection, that His name, given to Moses, proclaims the unchanging character of His nature and His work—I AM. There is no past or future, properly speaking, with our Master and Lord. Glory to His name! Rather should we see, in these miracles, the natural outcome of that love wherewith He loved us. He healed because, in a sense, He could not help it. He that wept over the city, could not withhold the touch of health from the citizens who came to Him honestly, believing in His power to heal.

Thomas Erskine wrote, "Until Christ's ascension He did not receive gifts for men*; the power of the Holy Ghost was not lodged in Him as the Head of the body, and so that power could not flow *internally* from Him into the members. The inflow of the power into them was a witness to the world of the exaltation of the Head. The great and common mistake with regard to the gifts is, that they were intended merely to authenticate or to witness to the inspiration of the canon of Scripture, and

* Eph. iv. 8.

that therefore when the canon was completed, they should cease; whereas they were intended to witness to the exaltation of Christ as the Head of the body, the church. Reader, do you not feel that if these things be so, then there is a nearness to God, and a walking in him, and a down-breaking of the creature in real Christianity of which you as yet know nothing."*

A very strong proof that the miracles of Christ were not merely intended to demonstrate His divinity is found in the fact that the Bible always avoids any such thing. God's existence and nature are always pre-supposed. The first words of the sacred writing "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," assume all that can be imagined of the miraculous power of the Creator. When the threats of vengeance were sent to Pharaoh the words were spoken "He shall know that I am God," etc; but of course we see that the primal object was the deliverance of the chosen people. The convincing of the Egyptians was a secondary result. Had this been the object of the miracles why were they not wrought for the doubters when they asked for one? They were performed only for those who had faith, or for pure benevolence, as in the case of feeding the five thousand.

Admiral E. Gardiner Fishbourne, of the English Navy, endorses the idea of Thomas Erskine, just

* See "Supernatural Gifts of Spirit," p. 19, from Erskine's "Brazen Serpent."

quoted. He says; in answer to the question, why these miracles now? *

"In mercy God is opening men's eyes to their past unbelief as to His power and love in Christ, ...

"He is endorsing real theology, and condemning the unreal imputative, merely speculative and powerless systems. . . .

"He is generating faith in the supernatural by witnessing to its reality, and proving that Christianity is not *effete* or less potential than it was in apostolic times, and showing that those who argue that it is so, and who limit the Holy One of Israel by teaching that divine joy, divine holiness, and divine healing were confined to apostolical times, have been, and are, doing irreparable damage to their own souls, while they destroy the unity of the church and its power over heathendom.

"These cures are to prove that Christ's love is not less than it was when He tabernacled in the flesh in Judæa, and *that His power is even greater now that He is enthroned at the Father's right hand;* and that it is now, as it was from the beginning, His desire to enthrone Himself by His Spirit, in the hearts of all believers.

"To prove to those who, in childlike faith, accept it, that the Word of God is inspired by the Holy Ghost, and can be understood by those who seek His enlightenment, *while it is a sealed book to all*

* Small pamphlet "Wholeness, or Holiness and Health through Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ." London: Elliot, Stock & Houghton.

who are without His teaching, however deep and extended is their human knowledge.

"To prove to this money grubbing, God denying and unspiritual age that there is neither progress nor real profit when the soul is not fully saved and sanctified.

"To prove to the false philosophers and unbelieving divines that the God, in whom we live and move and have our being, is known to, and knowable only in the Lord Jesus Christ by faith, while the reality of His presence, love, and power is demonstrated to reason by faith healing."

Erskine has the clear idea—the witnessing to the risen Christ as the living Head of the body. This will always be seen whenever the members evince that consecration and faith which allows the inflow and outflow of supernatural power.

One very important point has been entirely overlooked. Those people came very close to Jesus; much closer than most persons do to-day. Note that He did not heal at a distance, except where the messenger came specially on behalf of the patient. "*As many as touched* were made perfectly whole." He did not cast the devils out of a man while the sea of Galilee rolled between them, but when they actually met. This obvious fact has blinded men to a glorious parallel. We are told that this is the very reason why miracles of healing are not to be expected to-day. Jesus is not here, as He was then. Ah! is it so? "Lo I am with you alway, even to the end of the age," was spoken almost in the same breath with the

promise of the signs and wonders to "follow them that believe." * Men have failed to see the wonderful truth that it is actually possible, in this century of grace, to draw just as near to Jesus Christ as it ever was when He walked the streets of Jerusalem. The door of faith may be narrower than the door of sight, but it is wide enough to admit any soul that has resolutely laid aside "every weight, and *the sin* which doth so easily beset us." Eighteen centuries ago no sick man ever went to Jesus for healing, and at the same time left part of his body at home. He had to go with a whole purpose and a whole action. Just so, to-day. If you will take all you are or hope to be, all your doubts, all your fears, all your dread of men and men's opinions, and go to Jesus in an absolute and irrevocable consecration of soul and body, you will get near enough to "touch the hem of His garment;" and it is true to-day that "as many as touch are made perfectly whole." But you can't touch Him through a reservation, any more than you can receive the electrical current through a thick glass plate. Judas and John were both near to Christ. Judas had his doubts, his greed, his selfish desires, and he was repelled from the divine presence of the Master, and died a victim of sin and death. But John, with earnest purpose and honest love,

* Prof. J. Rendell Harris, of the Johns Hopkins' University, has done good service, through his studies of the mechanical measurements of the Greek text, in showing that the discredit, cast by the Revisers on the closing verses of Mark, the story of the woman taken in adultery and other passages, is entirely a mistake.

drew so near that he leaned on Jesus' breast, and the pulsing of that eternal heart imparted love and light and life: so that he lived a century, and was spared a death from violence. Moses lived to one hundred and twenty, a perfect physical man: Enoch walked with God three hundred years, till God took him; and Elijah, who like Moses, talked with God upon the mount, passed up in a chariot of fire. But each of these saints "knew God face to face," and there was no power in the hand of Satan to hurt them, in soul or body. My brother, if you press as near to Jesus as those men did, the life-power of His glorious nature will expel all the Judas elements of your entire being, while the John characteristics will bloom and blossom into marvellous and supernatural beauty. *Have you ever tried to touch Jesus?*

1.—Sickness from the Devil.

THE DEVIL.

Men don't believe in a devil now, as their fathers used to do;
They've forced the door of the broadest creed to let His Majesty through.
There isn't a print of his cloven foot or a fiery dart from his bow
To be found in earth or air to-day, for the world has voted so.

But who is it mixing the fatal draught that palsies heart and brain,
And loads the bier of each passing year with ten hundred thousand slain?
Who blights the bloom of the land to-day with the fiery breath of Hell,
If the devil isn't and never was? Won't somebody rise and tell?

Who dogs the steps of the toiling saint, and digs the pits for his feet?
Who sows the tares in the field of time wherever God sows His wheat?
The Devil is voted not to be, and of course the thing is true;
But who is doing the kind of work the Devil alone should do?

We are told he does not go about as a roaring lion now;
But whom shall we hold responsible for the everlasting row
To be heard in home, in church and state, to the earth's remotest bound,
If the Devil, by a unanimous vote, is nowhere to be found?

Won't somebody step to the front forthwith, and make his bow, and show
How the frauds and the crimes of a single day spring up? We want to know.
The Devil was fairly voted out, and, of course, the Devil 's gone;
But simple people would like to know who carries his business on?

REV. A. J. HOUGH.

In spite of the verse "I create evil," Isa. xlv. 7, and the famous account of the lying spirit's mission to Ahab's prophets, 2 Chron. xviii., we all believe that God is not, properly speaking, the author, of sin. Of course the coming and existence of sin, and sickness if you please, was included in the divine plan, or else God's foreknowledge has narrow limitations; but when in His wisdom He allows the evil it only seems, while condemning the voluntary actors, to bring out his glorious redemption. Now sickness is, most unquestionably, an evil. Good may result from it of course, but there is no use in trying to persuade a reasonable man that sickness, in itself, can ever be a good thing. We have already seen how God used it, or

allowed it to be used, as a whip to bring the children of Israel back from their sins; and we all know full well that it has often the same use and effect to-day. Most people think Job's case is a mysterious and strange exception, but I long ago determined that it is a regular type of God's dealings with the soul. Job was a good man; so good and honest as to be called "perfect" by God himself. But Job, although perfect in heart, was not *mature;* and God wanted him to grow. This Job evidently failed to see, and therefore strong measures were necessary. Now let us carefully note that Satan was the direct agent who stole Job's sheep and camels, killed his sons and daughters, and at last actually "smote Job with sore boils from the sole of his foot unto his crown." Yes, Satan did it all. Nowadays men would say "the visitation of God," but the inspired writer tells us it was a visitation of the devil. Shall we suppose that the old adversary has lost any of his venom? On the contrary, "he hath great wrath, because he knows that his time is short."

But let us particularly remember that Satan could not and did not make Job sick *till God gave him a distinct permission to do so.* Here we have a positive statement of the fact that Job had physical health by the keeping power of God alone, and that Job became sick only when that power was relaxed, for the purpose of opening his eyes to the advanced steps God wished him to take. We all know the story, and remember its significant close;

how God restored him to health and strength and possessions, as soon as the desired spiritual experience was received. O reader! you who are sick in body and have suffered for months and years, does not this wonderful narrative cause you to think that possibly you are halting and hesitating, failing to see God's leading, and just a little unresolved to say with Job to the very uttermost, "I abhor MYSELF?" That absolute death of self, how hard it is!

Again we read in Luke xiii. 11–17, of the "woman which had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years," who was healed on the Sabbath day to the disgust of the Jews. Jesus himself spoke the words, "ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, *whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years*, be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath day?" Truly it was a fit work for the Great Physician to break the chains of the prince of darkness, whether forged about the soul or the body.

Yet once more we have a plain statement of inspiration as to the origin of bodily disease. In Acts x. 38, Peter proclaimed *to the Gentiles*, that "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, *healing all that were oppressed of the devil;* for God was with him." It would be a very narrow interpretation that would limit this sweeping phrase to the few cases of demoniacal possession recorded in the gospel history. Evidently the entire list of healings is included, by the apostle, in this general statement of the daily work of

Jesus. Then those who are sick, are "oppressed by the devil." Most certainly they are; and last, but not least, we have Paul's distinct declaration, that his "thorn," whatever it may have been, was a "minister of Satan," sent "to buffet" him. Surely nothing could be more conclusive than this.

It being apparent then that disease is from Satan, and that its use, to the sufferer, is purely corrective; it follows undeniably that if the cause or reason for the correction be removed, there is no necessity for the means of correction remaining. The children of Israel left the task-master's lash in Egypt, and were not obliged to hear it crack in order to keep them humble. I mean by this, that I need not expect to carry a certain form of sickness to my grave, when the leading of the Lord has been seen and accepted. When the Jews turned to God, he received them, and always removed the plagues and bodily diseases which had been used as a means of punishment. And whenever a man came to Jesus, He accepted the faith as far as it went, and never refused to remove the suffering and physical disability.

We are now ready to turn to the Scriptures and read of the intent of the Atonement with reference to the work of Satan. Daniel prophesied that Christ would come after the seventy weeks, "to make an end of sins." Dan. ix. 24. He was to "restrain or finish the transgression," but of sins He would "make an end." What a glorious truth for the fully reconciled child of the King! But this sin is the work of the devil; and we have just

seen from the Word that sickness emanates directly from the same baleful source. Why then should not an end be made of that also? If it was done for Israel in the wilderness, shall we, of the dispensation of grace, be less favored? It is admitted that sickness is but the beginning of death, that it is, in fact, death's advance guard and active agent; but Paul tells us that Jesus partook of our flesh and blood, "that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, *that is the devil*; and deliver them who through fear of death were *all their life time* subject to bondage." Heb. ii. 14, 15. Here we are distinctly told that the devil has the power of death; and therefore it follows that he has the power of sickness, as the van of death's army. Now Jesus has not yet destroyed death, except in the promise. That "last enemy" still exists and exercises power over us all, "For it is appointed unto men once to die." But here we find a parallel without a flaw. Sin is the disease which leads to the "second death," the death of the soul. Sickness is the disease which leads to bodily death. The Atonement of Christ has fully provided for the soul a salvation which makes an end of sin now, so that we may "serve Him in righteousness and holiness all the days of our life," "being delivered from this present evil world;" and it has provided that we shall be delivered in the last great day, from the awful death which is the result and consequence of sin. But this latter deliverance is potential, we have it in the promise of God. The actual judicial day has not yet

arrived, but we confidently expect it and believe that our names will be found written in the "Lamb's book of life." The advance guard of spiritual death—sin—is thus already destroyed through the work of Christ in our souls, and the main body, the dreadful reality itself is potentially destroyed in God's promise, and will be actually destroyed, so far as we are concerned, after the glorious appearing of our Lord, or at least when the books will be opened, and the names contained therein published to the universe. Now mark the beauty of the parallel. Jesus "took our infirmities and bore our sicknesses," just as he bore sins, and thus He "made an end" of the former, precisely as He did of the latter. His Atonement therefore makes it possible for us to live, as Moses did, and serve Him in health of body, as well as in holiness of heart, "all the days of our life;" and it has provided that we *shall be* delivered bodily from the physical death which is the natural result of sickness. But just as before, this latter deliverance is potential; we have it in the promise. The actual day of its physical realization has not yet come, although we confidently believe it to be close at hand, when the "Lord himself shall descend from the heavens with a shout, and the dead in Christ shall rise first." "We shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye." "This corruptible shall put on incorruption, and this mortal put on immortality." Mark the parallel, here clearly and beautifully set forth. The corruptible soul, which still is peccable shall put on incorrup-

tion, and be safe forever: while the mortal body, shall put on immortality and thereafter laugh at death to all eternity. This sin and this sickness are alike the handiwork of Satan; but the beloved disciple assures us that, "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." 1 Jno. iii. 8.

2.—The Importance of the Body.

This brings us to a fundamental truth, which has been most sadly neglected, and has been terribly overgrown with weeds. The marvellous consummation which Paul so eloquently depicts in 1 Cor. xv., will never be brought about, *until* these so-called poor mortal bodies have been completely emancipated from the environment of sin, as well as from its effects. When "this mortal shall have put on immortality," "*then*," and not till then, "shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, "Death is swallowed up in victory. O, death, where is thy sting? O, grave, where is thy victory?" Dr. A. J. Gordon, of Boston, has given some attention to this subject, and severely commented on what he calls the "caged eagle theory of the body."* The devil has worked hard and with great success, to persuade men that the body is of

*See "Ministry of Healing." A book which furnishes the most absolute evidence that faith-healing, without the use of means, except the Scriptural ones of "anointing with oil," and "laying on of hands," has been practised in the church, all along the centuries, from the time of Christ to the present. It can be obtained at the Willard Tract Repositories, and from booksellers generally.

no special account. This general belief of the Christian church may be summarized as follows: My body is a great nuisance; it is a regular brake on the wheels of spiritual progress, it is continually forcing me to sin. I could be a tolerably decent Christian if it were not for this miserable body of mine. I make up my mind to act properly and put forth every possible effort of will, but my wretched body gives way and precipitates me into sin and all forms of evil. My soul is all right, it means to do well, but my body continually betrays me. It is a regular cage, with bars of steel, against which my poor soul beats its breast in vain. Heigho! I wish I was out of it. What a glorious thing it will be to see it stuck in a hole in the ground, it is nothing but dirt anyhow, and to soar aloft on spiritual wings, as free as the air of heaven. But as I cannot get rid of it till death sets me free, I suppose it is necessary as a discipline for my spirit. And so the strain runs on.

Now all this is straight from Satan, without any dilution whatever. Your body was made, with your soul, "in the image of God." True it was made out of dust, but please to remember that there was not an atom of sin in the world at that time; God had just made the dust, and "saw that it was good"; there was no evil in it. Now when sin entered, how was it, by an act of the body? Just here we come upon the old fallacy that the actual body of muscle and bone is capable of sin. This is the root of the whole thing. My muscle and bone, my hands and feet, my eyes and tongue

are merely dead matter, and are no more capable of sin or of sinning than is the marble statue. It is the intelligence within that sins. It is the mind and soul which God breathed into the dead matter, and which alone guides that matter and vivifies it, that is capable of a volition, and consequently, of a sin. There are some sins it is true, which, in their commission, necessitate the exercise of some physical appetite or desire; but these prove nothing. In fact the mere physical performance of these acts is not, strictly speaking, the sin at all. The gratification of lust is of course an outward sin of commission, but the real sin antedates the physical action. "Whosoever looketh on a woman, to lust after her, hath committed adultery already *in his heart*." A man steals money from a drawer. The sin lies in the mental or moral act within his soul, and not in the physical motion of his hand. Another commits murder. The sin is in his heart, not in the actual physical extinction of the life *per se*. In no one of these physical acts is there any sin whatever. The relation between the sexes is the most sacred known to man, in its proper place. The movements of the hand properly put forth, are right and necessary; and even the taking of a human life is perfectly sinless when the sheriff touches the drop. My brother, the body which gives you so much trouble is not your physical body at all. It is the "body of sin," the "old man," the inbeing of sin. This it is that causes you to do what you hate, and to leave undone the things that you would do. This it is

that reddens with anger, flashes with hate, burns with envy, festers with jealousies, puffs up with pride, exults in boasting, and destroys your peace. And this is that "body of sin" which "may be destroyed."—Rom. vi. 6. This body was not made by God. It was not formed from the "good" dust. It did not grow in heaven. No, it was manufactured by Satan himself, and was *infused* into the first man in and through his primal act of unbelief. Now, praise the Lord, this cage can be broken open, now and here. You may be "delivered from this present evil world." And you can soar just as high as you please in the atmosphere of perfect love and perfect peace and perfect health of soul and spirit and body. A bird cannot fly higher than the atmosphere; and so we cannot soar into the eternities, for we are yet in time; but we can fly as straight towards the sun as ever flies the strongest eagle, and never strike any cage bars either.

For centuries Satan has been at his old trick of quoting, or misquoting, Scripture; and he has systematically drilled Christians to repeat the everlasting excuse, "The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak." They forget one of the chief names of Jehovah in the old time: "The God of all flesh." He it is who, when Sarah laughed at what she believed to be a physical impossibility, said in tender reproach, "Is anything too hard for the Lord?"—Gen. xviii. 14. And He it is who told the weeping prophet "Behold I am the Lord, the God of all flesh: is there anything too hard for

me?" Jer. xxxii. 27. And centuries after the same God said to Paul, "My strength is made perfect in weakness" 2 Cor. xii. 9. This great truth was thoroughly impressed upon the heart of the great Apostle to the Gentiles. He never scorned his body. True, he said it was better to be with Christ than to remain in a sinful world, but he never hinted that he desired to get rid of his body. On the contrary no one has ever spoken so earnestly of his desire to retain it. Hear him exclaiming: "For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they but *ourselves also*, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves, groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit the redemption of our body." Rom. viii. 22, 23. The special point that Paul did not wish to lose his body, but only to have it glorified, on account of its circumscribed conditions, is luminously set forth thus: "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven. If so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: *not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon*, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." 2 Cor. v. 1-4

Who but Paul so earnestly entreats us to "present your bodies, a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto God; which is your reasonable service?"

Rom. xii. 1. Manifestly he is not speaking of the "body of sin" or the "old man," for to present sin as a holy and acceptable sacrifice to God would certainly be an utterly unreasonable service as well as an everlasting impossibility. * If we read the law of the sacrifices we are struck with the requisition that everything and every animal which was offered to God, should be absolutely "without blemish"; every sacrifice must be a "perfect sacrifice." I do not intend to arbitrarily distort symbols, and of course this signified and set forth the perfect nature of the Atoning sacrifice of Christ. But who will dare deny that we can also find a plain indication of that truth enunciated by the Savior, "No man having put his hand to the plow, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God?"—Luke ix. 62. "My son, give me thine heart," Prov. xxiii. 26, means the whole of it, of course. God does not ask for a piece of it. Jesus said again, "No man can serve two masters," Matt. vi. 24; and the Psalmist assures us that God will not give his glory to another. All these texts contain the idea of a complete, unreserved, consecration and dedication to God,—a "perfect sacrifice." But we may even go farther and say that

* I cannot forbear calling the attention of those who believe that the seventh of Romans contained the experience of an "advanced Christian," to this little difficulty. If, in this life, the "body of death," "the old man," "the flesh," etc. etc., are essentially identified with the actual mortal body, how in reason can I present this body, as a "holy and acceptable sacrifice unto God?" And, most absurd of all, how can it be a "perfect sacrifice?" Yet Paul says "I *beseech* you to do so."

there is another suggestion after all this. Is it going too far to imagine that a perfect body presented perfectly to God, and able to run upon His errands of mercy in all directions, is more "acceptable" to Him than a poor, dilapidated, sickly weakling, whose every moment is necessarily absorbed with self? You may answer that an invalid may truly serve God, and may manifest His sustaining grace. Very true. Israel in Egypt, toiling under the taskmaster's lash could, and to a certain extent, did do the same; but Israel on the other side of the Red Sea, and Israel in Canaan, served Him much better; and spoke so powerfully of His sustaining grace, and of His *conquering power*, that the world rings with the song of praise to-day. Miriam could never have sung her triumphal hymn while she was making bricks without straw, but she could have worshipped the God of the promises.

But we have not done with Paul. In 1 Cor. vi. 13, we read: "Now the body is not for fornication, but *for the Lord;* and the *Lord for the body.*" If my body then is "for the Lord," is it not reasonable to suppose that a whole body is better and more pleasing to Him than a mere wreck? "Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ."—v. 15. Here the apostle, beyond any possible question, speaks of our physical bodies. But, he says, they are "members of Christ." How dreadfully incongruous to think of Christ possessing "members" deformed and defaced by every kind of disease; especially when we remember

that disease is of the devil! We can readily look upon the scar of an old wound, but it is hard to tolerate the presence of a gaping, running sore. *It is a sign of corruption in the blood.* "What, know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you?" The tabernacle was not only entirely consecrated to God, and anointed in every part; but it was built of perfect materials. In such a temple the overpowering glory of God could dwell. But how can I (*if I have the light on the subject*) retain in my body a portion of the devil's work, and then look for the new Shekinah, the glory of the Holy Ghost to dwell within? "For ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's."—v. 20. Here the Apostle distinctly and undeniably stretches the infinite folds of the Atonement over the body as well as the spirit; for one, as well as the other, is "bought with a price."

Yet again, Paul says, "Know ye not thatye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17. "In whom ye are also builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit." Eph. ii. 22 "But Christ is a Son over his own house; whose house are we." Heb. iii. 6. And thus Peter speaks, "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, on holy priesthood, to offer up a spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus

Christ." 1 Pet. ii. 5, and Paul insists, "So now also Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life, or by death." Phil. i. 20. "But the body is of Christ." Col. ii. 17. Surely, in view of these marvellous texts, I should strive to welcome my Lord and Master into a clean house, a house free from any corruption of sin, or any of the remains or effects of sin. In this very line we find Paul offering his famous prayer, "I pray God your *whole spirit and soul and body* be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Thess. v. 23. And then follows the glorious assurance, "Faithful is he that calleth you, who also will do it." Here again we see the great yearning of Paul's heart for the day of complete redemption when the entire man shall, in perfect unity of being, stand before God. But we see with renewed force that Paul considered his body as absolutely necessary to that glorious consummation, and so he prays for the body in precisely the same language that he uses for the soul and spirit. Each must be preserved "blameless."

Jude ix. testifies to the importance of the body *before* the resurrection day, in a way that is as remarkable as it is strange. There we read that the great Archangel Michael disputed *with the devil* about the body of Moses. Here we have unimpeachable testimony to the practical fact that the devil has the power of death. Further than this, it seems as if this strange power of Satan over the body endures after death; at least if the idea be correct that the occasion of the dispute was when

Moses needed his body for the scene upon the Mount of Transfiguration. As is well known, it has been remarked that Elijah had never laid aside his body but that the body of the great lawgiver had passed under the power of death; and hence it is imagined that Satan opposed even the temporary use of the body upon that wondrous occasion. The thought suggested itself to my mind that the dispute may have taken place at the time of Moses' death. We know that Moses went up to the top of Pisgah, and that the Lord was there with him, and showed him all the land of Canaan. And then we are told Moses died, and the Lord buried him in a valley over against Beth-peor. There is an old tradition which has come down from the earliest times, amongst the Jews and Arabians, that when the moment for dissolution arrived, the Lord kissed him, and that the supreme ecstasy of that crowning manifestation of the divine love separated the soul from the body. Now, before the idea contained in this tradition is utterly condemned, let us consider a few facts. We are positively assured that Moses was not sick, but that up to his death he possessed perfect health and strength. Though one hundred and twenty years old, "his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated."—Deut. xxxiv. 7. It is therefore clear that he did not die from disease. But in all our experience death has never been known to result from any cause except sickness, decay or accident. The word of inspiration settles all question as to each of these. There was no decay, no disease, and no

accident. How then did Moses come to die? We have just seen that the devil has the power of death, and hence it follows that when the body comes to die, it must pass, in that sense, under the hand of Satan. Now death in Scripture is always spoken of as an enemy; and in this light we see Satan standing, with scythe in hand, ready to cut down the body, even if the soul escapes his power. Unquestionably, therefore, the devil appeared on the top of Pisgah to claim his dominion over the body of the greatest of the prophets. But at this point a wondrous vision rises before us. We see Mount Sinai "altogether on a smoke," and a terrible glory flashing from the thick darkness upon its summit. Moses has interceded for the great sin of the people, in the matter of the golden calf, and God has pardoned, at his word. Hungering and thirsting after God, Moses presses his request, "I beseech thee, show me thy glory." No honest prayer, from such a heart, goes unanswered; and God said, "I will make all my goodness pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee. And he said, *Thou canst not see my face: for there shall no man see me and live.* And it shall come to pass that, while my glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a cleft of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand while I pass by: And I will take away mine hand and thou shalt see my back parts: but my face shall not be seen."—Ex. xxxiii. 18–23. And all this was wondrously fulfilled. "And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed, the Lord, The Lord God, merciful and

gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth."—Ex. xxxiv 6.

God had nearly forty years of work for Moses then, and so He could not answer him any further. But the prayer remained before the throne, calling for the full response; just as thousands of God's servants have waited a score of years or more for the reply from heaven to their prevailing petitions. And now the scene changes to another mountain, and again God and Moses stand together looking out upon the promised land. The great prophet's words have all been uttered, the mighty leader's work is done, and his time on earth is over. "He who has the power of death" exultingly draws near to claim what he can as his prey, and the fatal dart is drawn. But now, after forty years, the urgent prayer of the thirsting soul makes itself heard,—"I beseech thee show me thy glory," and before death can discharge his shaft, God's mighty hand, that once covered Moses in the "cleft of the rock," is tenderly and lovingly withdrawn, and *God's face is seen at last.* Such ineffable glory is too much for a mortal body, and in an instant the spirit bursts all bounds of flesh and bone, and death is despoiled of a victim. Satan may "dispute," but the great Archangel replies, "The Lord rebuke thee," and Moses' body is laid to rest by heavenly ministers. The prayer offered upon Sinai is answered, after so many years, upon Nebo; and Moses sees God's face. The prayer for the flesh, that his feet might tread the promised land, was denied, and he was told to forbear asking; but

the greater request was finally granted. He looked upon the land and it delighted his eyes, he looked upon God, and it ravished away his life. Only the pure in heart shall see God, and none but the pure in heart will ever dare to pray, "I beseech thee show me thy glory."

"TO THE LAW AND TO THE TESTIMONY."

A powerful argument to show that God intended the Atonement to make provision for the body, as well as for the soul, can be found in the book of Leviticus. Beginning with the eleventh chapter, and running to the end of the fifteenth, we have clear and specific directions for bodily diseases. In the eleventh chapter is laid down the distinction between clean and unclean beasts, with the corresponding laws of diet. People foolishly imagine that the Jews were permitted to eat the ox, and were forbidden to eat swine, hare, shell-fish, etc., etc. purely for arbitrary reasons known to the Almighty; or that at best a mere symbol was desired in order to teach a spiritual truth.

We know that in Eden man was permitted to eat of every tree, and told that each one was good for food, but that he was restricted from the tree of knowledge. And while this command had all the moral significance desired, it also involved injurious physical consequences in its disobedience; even death. Now Moses expressly explained to the Hebrews that all God's laws and statutes had a perfectly reasonable basis. "And the Lord commanded us to do *all* these statues, to fear the Lord our God, *for our good always, that he might preserve us*

alive." Deut. vi. 24. These dietary laws were included in "all these statutes," and they were "for their good always," that the Lord "might preserve them alive." There is a very important thought here for Christians who profess absolute and entire consecration to God. The latest modern science thoroughly agrees with Moses that the list of "unclean beasts," are without exception, unhealthy, and actually injurious to the human system. *If therefore I have comprehended this light* upon the Word, and deliberately eat that which God told my fellow men not to eat "for their good always," I may expect to be brought under condemnation for committed sin, and possibly may experience physical punishment also. *

If a man so much as touched one of these unclean beasts he was ordered to wash himself and to be "unclean unto the even." And God said that if a man ate of any of these he "defiled himself," whereas God commanded, "Ye shall be holy, for I am holy." Lev. xi. 44.

When a woman bore a child, we read that she was to be purified during several weeks; and that she should then bring a lamb, and a young pigeon or a turtle-dove to the priest, "Who shall offer it

* As a matter of personal experience, I gladly testify that I long ago became convinced that God called me to separate myself also in this matter. I was satisfied that Moses' law was given "for my good," and that therefore I would fly in the face of that good if I disregarded it. I had abundant experience that many of the excluded animals were not good for my digestion, and so I willingly gave them all up, as soon as I was convinced of the truth in the matter. Praise the Lord!

before the Lord, and make an *atonement* for her; and she shall be cleansed."—Lev. xii. 6, 7. As if this were not strong enough, the eighth verse adds, in case of her inability to bring a lamb, that she shall bring two doves, "*the one for a burnt offering, and the other for a sin offering:* and the priest shall make an *atonement* for her, and she shall be clean." Here we have the idea of sin in an unavoidable bodily sickness or weakness, made specially emphatic; and our thoughts turn back to the primal curse on account of sin, "in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children."—Gen. iii. 16.

In the thirteenth and fourteenth chapters we find the law of leprosy. Always considered to be a special type of sin, its method of treatment is very important. From first to last we find that the leper had to do with the priest and God. The rite for cleansing is minutely described, and was very elaborate. Two birds were taken; one killed in "an earthen vessel over running water," the living bird dipped in the blood of the slain and then set free; while the leper was sprinkled seven times with the blood, after which he must shave and wash. Again after seven days, he must shave off all his hair even to his eyebrows, and after washing on the eighth day, he must bring "two lambs *without blemish*," one ewe lamb, with flour and oil. These the priests took and offered before the Lord. The lamb was slain "in the place where he shall kill the *sin offering*." The blood was to be touched upon the tip of the right ear, the thumb of the right hand, and the great toe of

the right foot; and the oil was used in a similar manner. Then the priest offered the *sin offering*, and made "*an atonement for him that is to be cleansed from his uncleanness.*" Now let us specially note that all this was to be done *after* the healing of the disease; or in other words, when the patient possessed in his body only the consequences or stigma of sickness. Then follow the strange directions as to the plague of leprosy in the walls of a house, and the visible appearance of it is described, with the same provision of bird's blood and sacrifice for its cleansing.

In chapter xv. we read of a general class of bodily disorders, which in all ages have been very widespread, and which afflict an enormous per centage of the human race, in one form or another, sapping vitality and impairing the life-forces of the entire system. Yet for these also we read that the same general line of treatment should be followed. The individual went to the priest, who offered "a sin-offering and a burnt-offering," and after certain washings he was made whole and clean.

In these cases, and in some others, the Jews were distinctly ordered, as we have seen, to go to the priest and have him offer a sacrifice, and make an atonement for them. Beyond a doubt this indicated the necessity of the blood to cleanse even from *sins of accident and ignorance*; but there is strong ground afforded also for the Atoning Sacrifice for disease.

But another valuable argument is found in The Law of the Priesthood. Reading carefully Lev.

xxi. we find that no man was allowed to perform the functions of the office who was not perfect physically. He must be very careful of his body so much so that he could not even touch the dead body of a dear relative; and he could not even marry a widow. But of his own personal physique we find the most explicit command. "Speak unto Aaron saying, Whosoever he be of thy seed in their generations that *hath any blemish*, let him not approach to offer the bread of his God. For whatsoever man he be that hath a blemish, he shall not approach; a blind man, or a lame, or he that hath a flat nose, or anything superfluous, or a man that is broken-footed or broken-handed, or crook-backed or a dwarf, or that hath a blemish in his eye, or be scurvy, or scabbed, or hath his stones broken. No man that hath a blemish of the seed of Aaron the priest shall come nigh to offer the offerings of the Lord made by fire; he hath a blemish; he shall not come nigh to offer the bread of his God. He shall eat the bread of his God, both of the most holy, and of the holy. Only he shall not *go in unto the vail*, nor come nigh unto the altar, because he hath a blemish; *that he profane not my sanctuaries;* for I the Lord do sanctify them." In close connection with this we see that a man afflicted with a certain infirmity which absolutely interfered with the exercise of full manhood's powers, "should not enter into the congregation of the Lord." Deut. xxiii. 1.

We have already considered the New Testament argument from Rom. xii. 1. In Heb. ix. 22, Paul

tells us that "almost all things are by the law purged with blood;" and in Heb. x. 22, he speaks of "having our bodies washed with pure water." Peter calls the church "a royal priesthood," 1 Pet. ii. 9, evidently referring to Ex. xix. 5, 6, where God said, "Ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine: And ye shall be unto me a *kingdom of priests* and an holy nation." John declares, in Rev. i. 6, that God "hath made us kings and priests unto God," and the "new song" of the elders and the redeemed before the throne bore the same glad refrain. Rev. v. 10 and xx. 6. And Paul also assures us that we have "boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh." Heb. x. 19–22. Manifestly all these latter references are primarily to the soul's experience, but there is certainly much food for thought in these close parallels between the body and the spirit. If God was so pleased to see a whole body, in the person of His ministering priest under the old covenant, is He any the less pleased under the new and better way?

A single reference will show that able commentators have seen the fact, that an atonement was required for bodily disease, under the Mosaic economy. The Rev. Samuel Wakefield, in his Theology, while discussing the Atonement, says, page 351; "But in proof that the life of animal sacrifices was accepted *in place of the life of man*, we observe, *that the law required a sacrificial atone-*

ment even for bodily disorders. All such unclean persons were liable to death, and were exempted from it only by animal sacrifices. This appears from the conclusion of the Levitical directions concerning the ceremonial which was to be followed in all cases. 'Thus shall ye separate the children of Israel from their uncleanness, when they defile my tabernacle that is among you.' Lev. xv. 31. So, then, by virtue of sin-offerings the children of Israel were saved from a *death* which they would otherwise have suffered for their uncleanness (bodily), and that by substituting the life of the animal for that of the offerer." This is certainly strong enough for the preceding argument. It is then clear that, under the Mosaic dispensation, God was the only physician, and He ordained that disease should be healed and its consequences removed, through the Atonement of blood.

4.—Who may be Healed.

Having established the great truths that sickness is from the devil; that the body is not a mere cage for the soul, but is destined to be united with it always; and that disease was formerly healed, and may now be removed, through the merits of the Atonement of our Lord; we are naturally led to inquire into the extent of this gift of God in Christ Jesus. After every objection has been met and vanquished, the last stand has always been made upon the ground, "It may not be God's will to heal me." I have previously considered this objection in a little tract, "If it be Thy Will,"* but it

* Willard Tract Repository.

needs some treatment here. The chief way to know God's will is to read His word. Let us therefore look for any directions to the sick which it may contain. G. W. McCalla recently compiled a valuable little book of Scripture texts, called, "The Word of the Lord Concerning Sickness," which is of inestimable value to any soul seeking light on this point.* Now we have already seen that in the earlier dispensations God was the Great Physician. Abraham prayed for Abimelech's household, Gen. xx. 17. Moses prayed for Miriam, Num. xii. 13. We have seen that Moses prayed for the people repeatedly. Solomon prayed for the nation; 1 Kings viii. 37-39, and 2 Chron. vi. 28-30. Elisha healed Naaman; 2 Kings v. Hezekiah prayed for himself and again for the people; 2 Kings xx. 5, and 2 Chron. xxx. 20. David prayed for himself; Psalm vi. 2, and expressed his faith in the healing power of God, Ps. xxvii. 1; xxx. 2, 3; xli. 3; xci. 3-7; ciii. 2-5; cvii. 20; cxviii. 17. Jeremiah does the same, Jer. xvii. 14; xxxiii. 6. Ezekiel xxxiv. 2, 4, 16, and Mal. iv. 2, all testify of the same glorious truth. Besides these unmistakable texts, there is a large class of promises which can just as well be taken for bodily healing as for anything else. "Cast thy burden upon the Lord and He shall sustain thee," Ps. lv. 22, and "Give us help from trouble, for vain is the help of man," Ps. lx. 11, are good examples of these. Any trouble, surely, is meant; and who will say that severe illness is not a trouble or a burden? The entire list of these promises,

* Willard Tract Repository.

in Old and New Testaments, can therefore be readily cited to show God's will in the matter.

But, outside of these and of the Mosaic economy is there no direction whatever to the sick. Let us see. The word

PHYSICIAN

only occurs eleven times in Scripture. In Gen. l. 2, we read of the physicians who embalmed the body of Jacob at the command of Joseph. 2 Chr. xvi. 12, speaks in gentle sarcasm of Asa's great mistake in seeking the physicians instead of the Lord; and of his death in consequence. Job xiii. 4 gives the idea that physicians might or might not be of use. Jer. viii. 22 intimates that no physician could heal the disorder of the chosen people. Matt. ix. 12, Mark ii. 17, and Luke v. 31, each quote a Jewish proverb, and apply it spiritually. *Mark v. 26, and Luke viii. 43 speak of the woman who had suffered many things of many physicians, spent all her living upon them and only grew worse. And finally, Col. iv. 14 mentions the former profession of Luke. The word MEDICINE is found only four times. Prov. xvii. 22 uses the word in a comparison, and Ezek. xlvii. 12 speaks of it in a figure. While Jeremiah declares, xxx. 13, that there is no healing medicine for his people,

*Luke iv. 23: "Physician heal thyself" may have been a proverb of sarcasm. Possibly it was customary to quote this saying at that time because of the general failure of physicians to heal anybody. It seems to suggest the idea that the profession were not ready to take their own remedies. In sober earnest, it was certainly a sarcastic saying, and the Word says it was a "proverb" in the days of Christ.

but that God can heal; and in xlvi. 11, he similarly uses the words, "In vain shalt thou take many medicines." We read however a great deal about Him whom we love to call the great Physician; how he healed every sickness and every manner of disease among the people, and *never turned away a single one.* "He healed all that were sick." The plain fact stares us in the face that the only human physicians mentioned in the Bible, are those who embalmed a dead body, those who killed King Asa, those of whom the poor woman suffered many things, and Luke, who changed his profession for the ministry, and, with the others, healed the sick by using the Lord's means. Matt. x. 1. And again, there is not a single command or intimation in the whole Bible which directs the use of medicine. Certainly this is very singular, to say the least.

But the singularity of this total neglect of the subject of doctors and remedies is fully explained, when we remember the very large number of references to the healing power of God. We have seen that this extends throughout the sacred books, from Genesis to Revelation. *The tree of life was left in Eden, and God is its sole owner and dispenser.* Thus we find miracles of healing everywhere, and *always* by the "mighty power of God."

If, then, God is the Healer, we only need to read his directions to the sick in order to know His will. Jesus Christ gave the first commission to the apostles, thus: "He sent them to preach the kingdom of God and to heal the sick. And they departed

and went through the towns, preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing everywhere"; Luke ix. 1, 2, 6. In Matt. x. we read: "He gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal *all manner* of sicknesses and *all manner* of diseases," and He commanded them, "As ye go preach saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand, heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils; freely ye have received, freely give": vs. 7, 8. When He commissioned the seventy disciples, He commanded them to preach, and "into whatsoever city ye enter heal the sick that are therein"; Luke x. 8, 9. This was certainly a free command to heal every one who came to them and asked for healing. Just before Christ ascended He said to His apostles and disciples: "And these signs shall follow *them that believe:* in My name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.' Mark xvi. 17, 18. And then He said, "All power is given unto Me in heaven and earth"; Matt. xxviii. 18; "And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the age"; vs. 20. But "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day and forever"; Heb. xiii. 8, and if He is with us, and is the same, why should it not be His will to heal to-day just as much as it was yesterday, when "He healed all that were sick"? Again, we are told that "God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith"; Rom. xii. 3. "Faith should not stand in the wis-

dom of men, but in the power of God"; 1 Cor. ii. 5, and "all the promises of God in Him are yea, and in him Amen, unto the glory of God by us"; 2 Cor. i. 20. This plainly means that it is for the glory of God to fulfil His promises in and to us, at all times.

In the twelfth chapter of First Corinthians we read of the existence in the church of "gifts of healing," in conjunction with others, all bestowed "by the same Spirit," upon various members in the church of that day. This follows as a natural consequence of Christ's parting words as recorded by Mark. The early Christian Fathers, for several centuries, assure us that "miracles" and "gifts of healing" prevailed in the church and were known to them as of frequent manifestation until the church mounted the throne in the person of Constantine. But all along the centuries we find record of simple faith in God's word being honored in the healing of the sick and in other ways. The testimony on this point is simply unanswerable, and convincing to any honest mind.* I do not adduce this evidence here, but simply mention it as of collateral importance. We are now simply searching the Word of God. It is well however to know that many of the children of the Kingdom have so understood the Word.

The case of Epaphroditus, recorded in Phil. ii 25–27, plainly indicates that he had recourse to God and not to the physicians, for "God had mercy on him." Now we well know that "without faith it is impossible to please God." Heb. xi. 6.

*See Dr. Gordon's Ministry of Healing.

Hence faith must always please Him. God therefore must always be glad to see trust in His power alone manifested by the sons of men. Again James tells us that "faith without works is dead," ii. 17. But what could be more tangible to ourselves and to others, than to show our faith in the promise, by our works, in actually relying on God the Unseen, for the visible healing of our bodies? "That men may *see* your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven." Then again James says, "Is any among you afflicted? let him pray." v. 13. Now notice that the apostle does not promise that the affliction shall be removed. This point is of the greatest importance. Prayer here is recommended as a comfort, and as a means of obtaining grace from on high, but no assurance is given that the trouble shall be removed. The apostle remembered that Jesus said "In the world ye shall have tribulation," and "If they persecute me, they will also persecute you." And the various epistles are full of allusions to the real discomfort, trouble and unjust treatment which may be expected by the true child of God. Those who sang so joyfully around the throne in John's vision, were "they who had washed their robes in the blood of the Lamb, and had come through great tribulation." Now with this fact sharply outlined before us, that Jesus not only does not propose to save us *from* trouble and affliction, but rather to save us *through* or *in* tribulation, we are ready for the vivid contrast afforded by the next verses.

"*Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders*

of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him." Jas. v. 14, 15.

Now no sane man can deliberately read these words without admitting that they plainly direct "any sick," to call for the elders, and be anointed with oil in the name of the Lord; whereupon he is assured that God will certainly heal him, through the prayer of *faith*, and that if he has committed sin, as an exciting cause of the sickness, it shall be forgiven him. That this command was not given to the immediate apostolic family is proved by the opening words of the epistle. "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad." Surely this is sufficiently comprehensive. Now it is certainly remarkable that the apostle should open his letter with the caution, "count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations, knowing this, that the trying of your faith worketh patience;" and should close it with a plain direction to "any sick," to be cured by the Lord alone, if he considered sickness of the body to be in any sense essential to growth in grace. He makes no exceptions whatever; no limitations, but gives the broad promise to "any sick among you."* And then, as if to amplify it,

* Undoubtedly we are to understand this now, among you who love the Lord in sincerity and truth. Manifestly it would be almost blasphemous for a rebellious soul, refusing allegiance to Jesus, to come and ask a favor at His hands, purely for selfish reasons.

he adds, "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much," vs. 16. Are we to confess our faults in this year of grace? If half the promise is dead, we have no business to use the other half, but should bury it also in the tomb of the apostles.

But James goes further still. As if pursuing the doubts that might arise, about these visible physical things, he recalls the fact that "Elias, a man *subject to like passions as we are*, prayed earnestly that it might not rain: and it rained not on the earth by the space of three years and six months. And he prayed again, and the earth brought forth her fruit." vs. 17, 18. Of course he did not mean to teach that every believer could pray *at will* for physical things, but to support faith in God's power to answer prayer in the domain of matter as well as of spirit. As to God's will in sickness, verses fourteen and fifteen absolutely settle that. Let the reader ask himself, if God had meant to give a promise of physical healing, through faith in Jesus Christ, could it have been given in any plainer language than we find in these verses of James' epistle? What could God say? What could be asked of Him? Should He have said, Let any sick man call upon me and I will certainly cure him by my power alone; would it be sufficient? Yet this is just what we do find in that word which shall never pass away, though the heavens and the earth be moved. God says, let any sick call for the elders; let them pray; let

them anoint the sick with oil in the name of the Lord; whereupon the prayer of faith shall save; the Lord shall raise him up, and forgive his sins. Now, in sober earnest, what more could be asked? If this is not clear, specific, and conclusive, what is? Let some one try to improve it, if he can. He will fail more signally than the man who attempted to improve on the parables of Jesus.*

5.—The Sin Unto Death.

We are well aware that Moses, "the man of God," was guilty of an offence in the wilderness, for which he was forbidden to enter the land of promise. His heart yearned to cross over Jordan, and he, who was never unheard, prayed for permission to go. But God said "Let it suffice thee; speak no more unto me of this matter."—Deut. iii. 26. Moses did not lose his spiritual standing, he did not get "under a cloud;" he continued to be the friend of God, and God spake to him face to face; yet this offence was "unto death." Even when God told him "thou shalt not go over Jordan," He gave him the unasked privilege of standing on the summit of Pisgah, and seeing the whole land. In no sense then was Moses' sin unforgiven; but it was "unto death."

With this clear example before us we may understand two passages in the New Testament. In 1 John v. 14–17, we read: "And this is the

* Let those who say that faith-healing is "only a privilege and not a command," recall the oft-repeated words of John Wesley, "Every command of God implies a promise."

confidence that we have in him, that, if we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us; And if we know that he hear us, whatever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of him." This is as unlimited a statement as could well be framed. But one thing John thought necessary to guard against, and that was the very point of physical healing. "If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death; I do not say that he shall pray for it. All unrighteousness is sin: and *there is a sin not unto death.*"

Now the merest beginner in the Scripture knows well that "the wages of sin is death," and we are absolutely certain that no sin, however insignificant, can ever be said not to clearly merit its wages. What then could John mean? He distinctly affirms that "there is a sin not unto death." This sin we are told to pray for, and we are assured that God will give life. Job was directed to pray for his friends, and God said "lest I deal with you after your folly."—Job xlii. 8. Was this entirely spiritual punishment that was remitted in answer to Job's prayer? The men who hunted out the marginal reference certainly did not work to support faith-healing, yet I find them connecting this verse in John with the one in Job, just quoted, and with Jas. v. 14, 15. Evidently they saw clearly that physical life is meant. To say that "there is a sin not unto death," means

that some sins do not necessarily require eternal death or damnation, is to falsify all Scripture. Physical death is then the only possible interpretation. Some attempt to explain that the sin "unto death," for which we are told not to pray, means the "unpardonable sin." But what is or was the unpardonable sin? Simply and solely persistent unbelief. The ascription of the miracles of Jesus to Beelzebub was nothing but the expression of stubborn unbelief. Now it is absolutely evident that the prayer of faith cannot be offered for a persistent infidel or skeptic; hence the "sin unto death" of our text cannot be the "unpardonable sin." Jesus set this point beyond dispute when He said so often "Thy faith hath saved thee." He only healed those who believed enough to seek Him.

We have additional light upon this point in 1 Cor. xi. Paul severely rebukes the converts for turning the Lord's supper into an occasion of feasting and tells them, "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh condemnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." And immediately he adds, "*For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep.*" Plainly he declares that many of these Corinthian Christians were sick because of their offence, and that many had died, for the same reason. Their sin was not unpardonable, but it was "unto death."

There can be no doubt in any reasonable mind that these things are repeated in our day. Many good people, who are most undoubtedly saved, fall

into sin through a variety of causes, and in consequence, while forgiven, are taken from the world or prostrated beneath chronic diseases. Their case is analagous to that of one who has sinned away his day of grace. The sicknesscan not be removed, and the apostle says, "I do not say that he shall pray for it." Many a chronic disease has been brought on by persistent, careless violations of a known law. The man does not seem to wake up to the importance of the matter, and at last, after repeated warnings, he is stricken down; and like the Israelites, turned back from Kadesh-barnea, he cannot pass over Jordan. He may remain a child of God, he may worship in the tabernacle under the shadow of the cloud, but he must tramp and die in the wilderness.* His sin is "unto death." It may seem uncharitable to some, but the truth must be spoken. There is strong reason to believe that if the true inwardness of the early death of so many active, earnest Christians could be laid bare, we would find some sin at the root of the matter, yes, even a sin "unto death." Satan hates a Christian, and is always on the alert for a chance to speed the fatal arrow. I do not mean to say that this is always the case; but I believe it to be true in the great majority of instances. It is almost incredible how many "good Christians" are persistent, habitual gluttons, stuffing their stomachs with unhealthy food at all sorts of hours;

* His *body*, so to speak, is justified but not sanctified wholly; hence the seeds of sin (disease) remain, and cannot be exterminated.

and you cannot make them feel that it is a *real sin*. They will admit that "it is not exactly right," but that is all. Many earnest working Christians, of full habit, sin frightfully through intemperance in the marriage relation, and yet are ready to laugh at any remonstrance, even when it comes from their own physician.*

People say, How sad the death of such a useful man! I wonder why God took him away in the midst of his usefulness, etc., etc. There it is again! Just like Job, laying it on the Lord. The devil took Job's children away, and it is extremely probable that he had also something to do with the departure of the "useful man." George O. Barnes, in his sharp way, says: "If I die before I am seventy years of age you may say the devil killed him." I would rather not say it in any case, for I cannot tell all that has been done or left undone; but I feel very sure that, in the great majority of cases, with adults at least, some sin has been "unto death."

---

*The extent of this evil, amongst the best people in the churches, is simply appalling. Men are paralyzed, and women die of consumption. The family physician can give the reason,—intemperance in the conjugal relation. The devil takes advantage of Christians on this point, because it cannot be publicly discussed in mixed assemblies. But every Christian, seeking to be entirely conformed to the will of God, should remember that bodily appetites are to be sanctified, as much as any thing else. Should I write facts which have come to my knowledge, the reader would be horrified beyond measure. I recommend on this subject, Rev. Mr. Platts' "Princely Manhood," or "Queenly Womanhood." They can be ordered through any bookseller, or direct from the publishers, S. Harrison & Co., Brooklyn, N. Y. Fifty cents each.

Solomon asked the question, "Why shouldest thou die before thy time?" Eccles. vii. 17, which clearly intimates that the wise man knew of no *necessity* for an early death.

It may be asked how are we to tell when any one has sinned unto death? It is extremely unlikely that such a man will be able to summon real active faith in the promise. For instance, a man is seeking sanctification, or the cleansing from heart depravity. He is addicted to the use of tobacco, and will not give it up, although it rises between him and God every time he asks for a clean heart. Of course he will never receive the cleansing, nor *ever feel that he has faith to grasp it*, while the filthy habit remains. A cripple told me that she was fully persuaded that healing by faith was not for her. There was no use arguing the case: she was convinced. Manifestly no prayer of faith could be offered for her; nor would she request it. These questions answer themselves when they arise. "There is a sin unto death." Therefore, there are people who cannot be healed of sickness, but no man can point them out unless specially directed by the Spirit. It is ours to hold up the promises; to lift up Jesus Christ as a whole Savior, and, sure as the Eternal Himself, he who looks in faith, will live.

6.—The Perfect Means.

It is in very truth a perfect recipe. But then all God's commands and statutes are perfect, and perfectly adapted to all men. Examining these directions to the sick, we see, first of all, that *perfect*

humility is necessary. Many a man will cry to God in secret, who will never let others know of his desire; but here he must first "call for the elders of the church." In order to this he must feel that others are of more importance before God than himself, and also that he is willing publicly to confess his desire, his helplessness, and his faith in God. Ah! confession is ever necessary. We must honor Jesus before men. Having thus prostrated self and confessed his belief, he is to be "anointed with oil in the name of the Lord." The old, old symbol and sign of perfect and entire consecration to God is here used, speaking of the fact that he who would receive from God, must belong to God, and that God knows no divided worship. Again, this rite, enforces the truth, that "God's ways are not our ways." Man seeks health through the medicaments of science, but God heals through simple faith, or if you please, blind belief in a power that is absolutely unknown and incomprehensible. And with this comes the thought, we must take God's gifts in God's way. Jordan is no better than Abana and Pharpar, nor so good to the eyes of man, but Naaman will never get rid of his leprosy till he goes and dips seven times in the muddy stream. Just here we come upon the idea of absolute, unquestioning obedience; the first law of the universe. "To obey is better than sacrifice." How many will gladly sacrifice time and money in the pursuit of health, who will not travel the path to Jordan's lowly bank. The great Assyrian general has a vast army still living.

So far, direction for human action and obedience. Now we have the promises of God. "The prayer of faith shall save the sick." A great deal is implied in these words. It is not said that the prayer offered shall be efficacious, but "the prayer *of faith*." In the days of Christ's earthly ministry it is highly probable that the individuals who came to him for healing, had real faith, not only in His power, but in His willingness to heal. In modern times, experience teaches that the faith required must be found, not only in the "elder," but in the patient. No elder or collection of elders can bear up, by their own faith, a patient who, in *the possession of his faculties*, withholds his own personal confidence and trust in God, as being both able and willing. Again, the "prayer of faith" can not thus be jointly offered if *anything whatever* stands between the patient and God. Examples of this have been frequently observed by all who pray with the sick. In other words, true, realizing faith in God cannot and does not exist in a soul which, in any way whatever, holds back "part of the price." Many of the "best people in the world," when brought face to face with God in dire extremity, evince an unwillingness to give up some special appetite, or passion improperly indulged, or refuse to become absolutely nothing in God's hands. They are not willing *to be, to do and to suffer*, to the very uttermost application of these verbs. Some action, some confession, some fear of people's opinions, and of what men will say of them; an unreadiness to devote every moment and

every ability entirely to God; a desire to retain some small portion at least of this world's goods, social standing, amusements, and employment; some liking for tobacco or other sensual indulgence, or a desire to be healed simply to be rid of discomfort and not solely for the glory of God: one or more of these things stands between the soul and God. In all such cases "the prayer of faith" is simply impossible. The elder may be pure in motive and strong in trust, but it will avail nothing for the ultimate end in view, until the way is clear. There is only room upon the bridge of faith for Jesus *and the naked soul.* Now if this complete "prayer of faith" be offered, if all these conditions be fully met, God is pleased, and, more certainly than that the heavens and the earth exist, "the prayer of faith *shall save the sick.*" Jesus himself said, more than once, "thy faith hath saved thee." I mean what He meant. Faith is the hand with which I reach out and take the benefits of the Atonement.

"And the Lord *shall raise him up.*" The excellency of the power is of God and not of us. "We must believe that God is, and that he is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him;" but He alone does the work. A man, alone in a boat, without sail or oar, throws a rope to the steamer, and is drawn along with speed and safety. So we throw out the rope of faith, and Jesus draws us into the harbor, while we sit and sing praises to the "mighty power of God." The promise is just as absolute as any in Scripture, and God always

fulfills His word. We must notice here that nothing is said about the precise manner, nor the time of the raising up. It may be instantly; it may be gradually. Cases have been known where the patient has been directed to certain special remedies, in such a way as to leave no doubt as to God's will in the matter. A lady, known to the writer, was impressed to drink Poland water. She did not know anything about it, and had not heard the name. But she inquired for it, found it and was speedily healed. In this case the Poland water *may* have been no more beneficial in itself to her than the water of Jordan was to Naaman; but it is highly probable that she would not have recovered without it. I myself was raised up, after my seven years' sickness, without any medicine whatever; but the cure was gradual, not immediate. At least the physical sensations of health came slowly. This taught me invaluable lessons of momentary, continuous trust in Jesus as my healer; and impressed upon me that I had and have no strength of my own, properly speaking. I *always* look to Him for everything, and He never leaves me nor forsakes me. This demonstrates the truth of our present argument. It is the Lord who raises up, and He alone.

A personal experience here may be valuable. Some time ago I wanted to take a ride with a friend. I *felt* tired, and quick as a flash, the devil said, "Wait till you have one or two good night's sleep and get your strength built up a little, and then take your ride. You know saddle exercise is

rather severe, and your horse is lively; it will exhaust your vitality to ride to-day, and injure you. perhaps seriously." How reasonable it seemed, to be sure! But "the entrance of the word gave light," and I exclaimed aloud: "Build up *my* strength; *my* vitality: praise the Lord, I have'nt any at all, it all belongs to Jesus. The thing is perfectly reasonable; I have not been overworking myself. So I will go, and it will not hurt me in the least." I dressed at once, took the ride, praised the Lord all the time, and felt a great deal better instead of worse. "Is anything too hard for the Lord?"

"And if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him." Here we see the wondrous liberality of God's grace. Not only healed in body, but cleansed in soul. There is, however, a very clear inference here that is extremely important. It appears, from these words, that the apostle, and the Holy Ghost who directed him, fully appreciated the close connection between sickness and sin. First, it is plain that the sickness is a result of sin (*probably* in the patient, but certainly somewhere); and secondly that God will not heal without also forgiving. In nine cases out of ten sickness is caused by some personal sin; in which I include all violations of the strict Biblical laws of health, diet, etc. Of course the Sin-Bearer will not remove the effect and leave the cause; so the sin must be forgiven. This is strong testimony to the truth of the idea, previously advanced, that, even in miracle, God does not actually break His

laws, but uses other laws to remove the cause as well as the effect. I take it that God's law, if law at all, is a truth; and of course God cannot break a truth; for that would be destroying Himself, who *is truth.* The word law is here used in the sense of a *principle.* In healing the disease, Jesus forgives the sin; and thus the glorious Atonement is used, in its fullness. Many a sufferer is compelled to exclaim, I suffer justly, I brought it on myself. True, but the Great Physician will forgive the sin, and bear the sickness for you. Truly this way of physical life in Christ Jesus, like all the ways of God, is a perfect way!

How beautiful and helpful it is to thus trace out God's teachings! What could be more complete, or more satisfying to the Christian than this *Scriptural means of Healing?* We have seen that it requires humility, confession of faith, absolute consecration and surrender, implicit obedience and living faith in God's word; and it promises and sets forth salvation from sickness, this to be by the hand of God alone, and complete cleansing from sin in the soul. What child of God can ask a better way? And finally, in these acts of consecration and faith we find the suggestion of the great underlying principle, that God is always ready to give life to man, if only man will devote the life to God. God's salvation for the soul requires that the "new heart" be entirely given to Jesus; and God's salvation for the body stipulates that the new physical energy be devoted to His service. Praise the Lord!

CHAPTER IV.

KEPT FROM SICKNESS.

"Himself bore our sicknesses."—Matt. viii. 17.

IF, when I read, "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness," (1 Pet. ii. 24) I am authorized to believe that the words mean just what they say, and indicate that Jesus has actually borne all my sin of commission and of principle, of act and of depravity; surely when I read that "himself bore our sicknesses," that he lifted them up as a load, etc., I must infer that it is not at all necessary for me to bear sickness, any more than sin. If this is not true, there is an end to all sense in language, and nothing can be predicated upon God's word.

This chapter need not be greatly extended. When we have acknowledged that Jesus came to save us from all sin in "this present evil world;" and that sickness is a work of the devil, and allowed by God as a corrective, not merely as a judicial punishment; we can not possibly hesitate long to admit that Jesus will keep us from disease as well as from sin, if *His conditions are met.*

If the soul is wholly the Lord's, without any possible reservation, He will keep it from sickness. But there is the point of stumbling. It is so hard.

to see the necessity for sanctification in the body and even harder "to present the body, a living sacrifice," when the duty is seen. There is a text of Scripture that should be written in living light over the daily pathway of every sanctified Christian,

"WHO HATH DESPISED THE DAY OF SMALL THINGS?"
Zech. iv. 10.

It is the "little foxes" that spoil the *vines;* they don't waste their time gnawing at *weeds*, they nibble the vines that are bearing "tender grapes." To be plain, a weed requires strong measures to kill it, but a very little thing will spoil and destroy a fruitful plant. It is when we are bearing fruit for the Master that very little, little things stand in the way of our obeying the command, "come up higher." Christians who have consecrated every power and disposition of the soul to God, often fail signally to see the necessity or the method for consecrating the body also, *except in service.* They are alive to the necessity of working for Jesus with the body, but the consecration of natural appetites, desires and affections is strangely wanting. We see some, who profess, and no doubt enjoy, perfect love and purity of heart, using tobacco, over-eating or drinking, rashly neglectful of proper sleep, working eighteen or twenty hours a day, or habitually violating established sanitary laws. Often this is done in ignorance; they have not seen the light on these points. But God says "come up higher"; and the bodily illness consequent upon

these offences operates slowly and surely to open the eyes to the truth.*

The whole thing turns upon that glorious promise "If we walk in the light as He is in the light." Ah! here is the condition, *we must walk in the light*, or there will be no "fellowship" and no "cleansing from all sin." The "cleansing from all sin" is only promised to those whose spirits obey God in every little thing; and exemption from sickness can only (through faith) be his whose body obeys in all things.

As I have intimated in my own confession, the great fear in this matter is that we may get sick, in which case others must know it, and the profession apparently fall into disgrace. I thank God for a revelation on this point. I saw that if I hesitated for this reason, it was clear that I was not delivered entirely from that Spirit that "loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." The temptation was to refrain from taking so radical a ground for fear that, if I failed, men would know it; whereas I might profess Scriptural holiness, and be conscious of sins, without any man being aware of my fall. Ah! God knows. As soon as this became clear to my mind, I resolved in the strength of Jesus, to confess His glorious

* People are often criminally ignorant. They could easily know so much better. Some professors of holiness are so grievously mistaken as to suppose that the marriage relation gives unlimited license for sexual indulgence. A few minutes reading in any good medical work would convict scores of such people of *real sin in this matter*. But they must learn, by the slow method of sickness and experience.

work *to the uttermost*, and not to allow a single thought of the future to enter my mind for a moment. Anyone can see that, professing to trust Christ for exemption from sickness, while you are contemplating the possibility of speedily falling ill, *is not trusting Him at all.* As well might a man say, "I am trusting Jesus this moment for cleansing from all sin, but I rather expect to sin before night." Such professions are only an insult to God, and are miserable travesties on true faith.

I sometimes fear that the teachings on holiness have not always shown that "boldness to enter into the holiest" which they should have manifested. Far be it from man to boast; and undoubtedly the less said about the future the better. But when man or devil suggests the question, "Now do you really expect to live one year, one month, one week, even one day, without sin?" we should answer in faith, I do not expect "to continue in sin," but I expect the Lord to perform His word.

So, of my body, I can say, not only that Jesus healed my past illness by His divine power; but I gladly confess that, while walking with Him, He preserves me in perfect health of body, just as He keeps my soul from sin. And thus Jesus has *all* the glory. Praise the Lord!

The "walk with God" is the most delicately balanced union in the world. There is only room for Jesus and me. Everything must be put away, and every leading of divine love must be instantly followed. Temptation to sin is useful and benefi-

cial in keeping constantly before our souls the great truth, spoken by Jesus, "without me ye can do nothing;" and temptation to sickness is not wanting to remind the trusting Christian that Jesus alone is the "Savior of the body."

If I am asked what I mean by "temptation to sickness," I reply that Satan produces frequently upon me the preliminary symptoms of cold, headache, or other sickness." Instantly I look to the Great Physician and say, Dear Lord, thou hast taken my infirmities and borne my sicknesses. These symptoms are a temptation of the devil, deliver me. And lo! the indications vanish, and I am not sick at all. For five years I have known *temptation to be sick*, just as distinctly and unquestionably as any temptation to sin. But the dear Lord always keeps His word, and "with the temptation provides a way of escape, that I may be able to bear it." Glory be to his name alone! In this way the "keeping power" against sickness is made just as much to depend upon, or to work through faith, as in the case of sin. I cannot rest upon past pardon; I must trust to be kept in the cleansing fountain to-day. And just so, I dare not rest upon yesterday's healing, but am constrained to actively trust, as I breathe, moment by moment.

The life of faith, in any path, is a life supported by only one breath at a time.

CHAPTER V.

OBJECTIONS AND QUESTIONS.

1.—IF PAUL THOUGHT SO MUCH OF HIS BODY, WHY DID HE CALL IT HIS "VILE BODY?"—(Phil. iii. 21.)

THE apostle, as I have shown, was always looking towards the great day, when Jesus shall come and bring about the full reunion of the soul and body, in the glorified state. In this case he was expressing the same thought. He says, "For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." The word translated vile is *tapeinosis*, and means *low estate, humiliation, abasement.* That is, the apostle spoke of his body being in a low estate, not the highest possible condition; as being abased, not exalted; humiliated, not glorified. It is plain, therefore, that this verse does not bear against our position in the slightest. On the contrary it serves to enforce the idea that a body destined for such a marvelous "change," cannot for a moment be called "vile" in the sense of worthless or repulsive. Paul cherished his body, though it was in a "low estate" and ardently longed for the

time when it should be glorified. Not the faintest shadow of an argument in favor of sickness can be deduced from this reference.

2.—Trophimus.

The case of Trophimus, whom Paul says he left behind him "at Miletum sick."—2 Tim. iv. 20, is of some importance. Why did not Paul pray over him, raise him up and take him along? This question naturally occurs to the mind of an honest inquirer; but the case can readily be shown to be in perfect accord with the Scriptural doctrine of healing. For two years, at Ephesus, and for three months, at Miletum, Paul had healed the sick continually, and not one single case of failure or incomplete restoration is even hinted. Now was Trophimus affected with a disaster that defied the power of God? Did Paul fail to pray with him? Or was it the Lord's will for him to be sick?

Dr. Boardman, in the "Great Physician," has treated this point with ability. He presents the idea that Paul was on his way to Rome, a prisoner. Trophimus was not obliged to go, and very probably the Lord wanted him to stay behind. So, just on the eve of the vessel's departure, Trophimus was taken sick. Of course he and Paul prayed for healing, but in this case it was delayed. Paul went on to Rome, and Trophimus was left to work for the Lord in a different sphere. Paul was not a stranger to gradual healing, for he had seen Epaphroditus sicken, and though he prayed, yet

the patient drew "nigh unto death," before the turn came and the Lord raised him up.—Phil. ii. 25–29. This accords most fully with the timeless nature of the promise in James. "The Lord shall raise him up," gives no time, but the fact is as true as God's inviolable word.

But there is another thought about this case. We have not any record of Trophimus' personal experience. We know he was a Christian, a companion of Paul's, an Ephesian, and a worker in the new cause. But we do not know his precise inward experience, as in the case of Paul. Now it is perfectly possible that Trophimus made a mistake, or that he did not absolutely follow the leading of the Holy Ghost. He loved Paul, and desired above all to keep his company. We will suppose that God desired him to enter another sphere of labor, and that, very possibly, certain delicate indications of the divine call had reached him. But his affection for the great apostle, and his own soul-joy in his company, persuaded him to close his eyes to anything else, and he determined to go to Rome. Then sickness fell upon him. He could not go; but he could pray. Yet though he prayed, and Paul himself doubtless interceded, he could not be raised up till he had seen and accepted God's will. This he did not do until the ship had gone and the thought of Rome had been banished from his mind. With the bias removed, there is no doubt that God's leading became plain, and that Trophimus arose and went to work where God called him. Of course, all

this is theoretical and inferential, but it is perfectly possible. Finally, there is nothing at all in this case to shake for a moment the belief in God's plain promise.

3.—Paul's Thorn.

In the case of the Apostle, we are confronted by the fact that he repeatedly relates his experience; and protests that God "always caused him to triumph in Christ." He furthermore distinctly avers that he "fought a good fight," and even set himself up as an example for others. See 1 Cor. xi. 1, 4, 16. Phil. iii. 17. 1 Thes. i. 6–7. 2 Thes. iii. 9. 1 Thes. ii. 10. In other words, Paul made the most unhesitating profession of personal cleansing from all sin. Now if Paul became sick, is not the whole doctrine of this book overthrown at once? Let us see.

Paul had a "thorn in the flesh." Like most other matters concerning him, this fact comes from his own mouth, in open confession. He was wonderfully fond of "confession with the mouth." In the first place no one can deny that this "thorn" never clouded Paul's faith in God's willingness to heal everybody else, of any possible affection. The record of his work absolutely established this. Dr. Boardman pertinently asks, "Why then should it cause *us* to doubt?" Further, we see that he himself had no doubt about it, but took it straight to the Lord. Three times he prayed, and the trouble still lingered. Why was this? Had Paul reached a plane upon which temptation was

impossible? Did his faith not need exercise? Well, he exercised it, and it grew so strong that God answered him, and distinctly explained the whole matter to him. The "abundance of the revelations" made to him had been so great and so unspeakable, that this "thorn" came to "buffet him," "lest he should be exalted" by the marvellous favors shown him. The whole aim of the thing was to establish, as never before, in the apostle's heart, that even he, with all his revelations, was absolutely nothing apart from Jesus. It was not what he had been forgiven, not what he had received, not the measure of blessings he felt and experienced, but the personal abiding presence of Jesus, excluding and exterminating any possible form of self in the inmost soul. This was the lesson, *and Paul learned it*, and exulted in the knowledge, glorifying God.—2 Cor. xii. 7–10. See also xi. 30.

There are several points in this case that are important. First, the word translated "infirmities," is *astheneia*, meaning literally *weakness*. It is the same word rendered in vs. 9 "weakness," and in vs. 10, "weak;" also in xi. 30, "infirmities," and xi. 29, "weak." I am not stickling for a shade, but it is plain that anything like virulent disease is not indicated in the text. This is amply sustained by the personal history of the Apostle. One thing is certain, that the "thorn" never prevented him from working "more abundantly than all" the rest of his brethren; and he distinctly affirms that he "ceased not to warn every one

night and day with tears" for a "space of three years."—Acts xx. 31. He must have enjoyed very good health during that long ministry; and when he died, it was not from any sickness, or even a "thorn in the flesh." It is then clear that Paul's "thorn" was in no sense a disabling affection. The Lord did not allow it to stop Paul's work, but *to make him more fruitful.* You, therefore, who are seeking consolation in utter prostration under permanent disease, will not find any reason for continued inaction in this record. Paul said, "Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life or by death," Phil. i. 20; but he emphasized the fact that, if he lived, it was to "labor," vs. 22, not to lie idle upon a sick bed.

We may assume from the facts that there is no *necessity* for a "thorn in the flesh," such as tormented Paul, unless, like him, we have been "caught up into the third heaven." Also, that if a "thorn" has made its appearance, we have Paul's example for steadfastly praying *in faith* for its removal, until we get an answer from the Lord about which there can be no mistake.

But further, we are led to inquire as to the nature of the "thorn." If it was not active disease, what was it? There are two well known suppositions on this point. One is that his eyes never entirely recovered from the blinding effect of the light on the Damascus road. The other is that his "bodily presence was weak, and his speech contemptible."—2 Cor. x. 10; and these physical deficiencies constituted the "thorn." Now nothing

could be more absurd. His eyes were good enough to enable him to write "with his own hand," those closely covered parchment rolls, the transcribing of which taxes good eyesight to-day. But his own words absolutely settle both these points. If the "thorn" had been in his eyes, it would have dated from the day of his conversion; and the supposed defect in appearance would have been much older. But his express language is that this "thorn" was given him to keep him from being exalted by the wonderful revelations vouchsafed to him, *long subsequent* to his conversion. Again in 2 Cor. x. 11, Paul sharply declares that the talk about his insignificant presence and contemptible speech was utterly false, and avers that his word of mouth will be found fully equal to his pen. Still further, he specially informs us that this "thorn" was "the messenger of Satan." What frightful blasphemy it would be to assume that a partial blindness, caused by the visible manifestation of Jesus Christ, could by any figure of speech, be called "the messenger of Satan!" And almost equally abominable would be the application of these words, to the natural stature and appearance of the body, which owes its very existence to the creative power of God.

It is noteworthy that Paul speaks of his trials in detail, but does not mention sickness. In 2 Cor. vi. 4, 5, he writes, "In much patience, in affliction, in necessities, in distress, in stripes, in imprisonment, in tumults, in labors, in watchings, in fastings." And in the eleventh chapter he enumerates

again his persecutions and troubles. "In labors more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft" (see 1 Cor. xv. 30, 31. 32. 2 Cor. iv. 8–11, vi. 9). "Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils of mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren. In weariness and painfulness (*mochthos*—labor, toil), in watchings often, in cold and nakedness." The "thorn" is mentioned in the following chapter, so that we have here the strongest reasons for believing that Paul had no sickness or disease, properly so called, in all this previous experience, for no word of such a trouble is found in the terrible catalogue of his afflictions and persecutions. After all the "thorn" may not have been a real disease.

It is perfectly clear then that the "thorn" was a special affliction sent upon Paul after his marvellous experience, for the special purpose of causing him to rely, not upon the gifts of God, but solely upon the giver Himself. And even this affliction or sickness is expressly stated to have emanated from Satan. But it will be urged that after all has been said does not this case disprove the provision in the Atonement for all sickness? This brings us to a very special question under the subject of the thorn.

Did Paul Recover?

Do not be startled. Let us carefully and prayerfully examine the record. "To the law and to the testimony." Without question there is no ground in Paul's case for any doubt as to God's willingness to heal all disease. This has been abundantly shown already. But I do not feel it right to relinquish the matter at this point. Is it true that Paul prayed three times, but that God refused to grant his request, while promising him grace to bear up under the affliction? I unhesitatingly affirm that

The Thorn in the Flesh was Healed.

The only case in Scripture similar to this is that of Moses, when he besought God to let him pass over Jordan, and the Lord told him not to speak any more concerning the matter. But the two cases are not at all analogous. Moses had sinned, and God's word *had gone forth*, "because ye believed me not to sanctify me in the eyes of the children of Israel, therefore ye *shall not* bring this congregation into the land."—Num. xx. 12.

When, therefore, Moses asked to go over Jordan, he asked God to break His word. It could not be; but, as we have seen, the Lord bore him over a better Jordan, into a fairer land. But Paul's thorn was not punitive; it was a preventive. So he distinctly states. And when he prayed for its removal, he asked God not to break His word, but to destroy one of the works of the devil; the very thing Jesus Christ came to do.

If it be argued that the apostle continued to need the thorn, and therefore God could not, in wisdom, grant this request; I reply that, if this be true, it follows that Paul did not learn the lesson which the thorn was sent to teach. God would certainly not allow a "messenger of Satan to buffet" his chosen apostle, except for a purpose. That purpose was to teach Paul that he was nothing but weakness, apart from Jesus. This we are distinctly told. Now if the thorn remained, it was solely because Paul did not learn the lesson. But he did learn it; nothing can be more positively certain than this. To suppose that Paul felt the thorn, realized what it was for, had God's word for it; and then, cherished the thorn, refusing to accept and apply its teaching, is to suppose that the apostle was openly rebellious, and wilfully sinful, even when he said, "I always triumph in Christ." If any Christian can accept this dilemma, let him do so.

But it may be answered, look at the language used; does it not say that the Lord told Paul he should have grace to endure? No it does not. The facts are these. Paul prayed. No answer. Paul prayed the second time. No answer. With undaunted faith, Paul prayed the third time. And unless he had less faith than Elijah he would have kept on seven times, if necessary. But at the third request, God answered. He said, "My grace is sufficient for thee." The word translated sufficient means suffice, satisfy. When we remember that we are "saved by grace," Eph. ii. 5–8, it is easily

seen that the word "grace," in the text, may well have the element of salvation in it. In fact the idea of salvation is inseparably linked with the word, in all the Scripture. Now God told him "My grace is sufficient, or satisfying." This would surely accord with all Scriptural analogy, if we understand the reply to be an assent and not a denial. Suppose I should go to God with a besetting sin, a regular and genuine "messenger of Satan," and cry for deliverance; only to be met with the assurance that I should receive grace to bear it? *What! to bear a sin!* To retain that which is hateful to God! *Grace to sin, and to bear up under it!* What a thought! Yet here we are plainly told that a "messenger of Satan," having accomplished the end for which it was allowed, is to be retained and *endured by grace.* Could anything be more awfully absurd?

Again, Paul remarks at once; "Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me." What Paul! do you mean to say that you will deliberately glory in "messengers of Satan," even if it be that "the power of Christ" may be shown? If so, how did you come to write that famous sentence, "Shall we continue in sin, *that grace may abound?* God forbid!" Shall we cherish or retain any "messenger of Satan," merely that Christ's power may be manifested in continued deliverance? Is that the meaning of the apostle? God forbid; indeed. How plain it is that he gloried, not that these things came, nor that they remained, nor yet that

that he was enabled to bear them; but rather in that he *was delivered from them.* See the very context itself, for proof of this. He "took pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses." Did he take pleasure in these things *within himself*, or externally? Did he not take pleasure and glory in the fact that, in the midst of the burning, fiery furnace, he walked absolutely unscorched, because one, like to the Son of God, walked with him, saying, Courage Paul, "My grace is sufficient for thee?" Paul had no belief in "imputed holiness," nor in imputed health either. He does not say I am weak, but I am called strong on account of Christ's strength, imputed to me. But he declares, "When I am weak, then I am strong." How? By the "power of Christ," in which alone "I glory."

With special emphasis, he refers, in the twelfth verse, to his miraculous gifts, He says, "Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds." This serves to prove that he had no doubt as to the power and willingness of God to heal, for "they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover," was one of the "signs" mentioned by our Savior himself, as following "them that believe."

The rational and Scriptural view of this case then is this. The thorn was sent as a precautionary measure, or a warning. It had a lesson. This Paul fully learned, and asked for healing. After a trial of his faith, his request was graciously

granted. Whereupon he praises God that in all things, in infirmities, persecutions, reproaches, necessities or distresses, God's grace is sufficient and satisfying, and gives him complete deliverance from all the "messengers of Satan." And in confessing this he confesses that he is so "weak" that he cannot save himself in the least degree, but Christ is so "strong," that He can and does save to the very "uttermost."

Ah! God is a personal God, Jesus Christ a personal Redeemer, the Holy Ghost a personal Sanctifier, and the salvation of the Cross is a *personal* salvation "in this present world." It saves the individual through and through. It saves him *from*, and not *in* or *under*.*

4.—The Man Born Blind.

In the ninth chapter of John we read of a remarkable case. The query of the disciples, "Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?" and Jesus' reply, "Neither has this man sinned, nor his parents; but that the works of God should be made manifest in him," may be cited to disprove the idea that sickness is the result of sin. The Lord give us light to examine it!

In the first place I am struck with the plain fact that the apostles all thought the presence of

*I would say that this idea of the "thorn" was first given me by Dr. Cullis, two or three years ago. He simply stated it as his belief that Paul was cured. Since then the Lord has opened to my mind the beautiful unfoldings of the truth, and I give Him all the glory.

such a calamity a sure evidence of sin, either in the man or his parents. They considered the affliction to be a punishment for actual transgression. But in this respect they were mistaken, precisely as were the the three friends of Job. The Patriarch of Uz was ill in body, not as a punishment, but in order to lead him to a depth of surrender of which he had not dreamed. Paul's thorn was purely precautionary, and intended to warn him against self-conceit. And Jesus said that this man was blind, not because of special offence, but that the works of God might be manifested in him. Now when we remember that Job's boils and Paul's thorn came straight from the hand of Satan, and when we read that "for this purpose was the Son of God manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil," it becomes plain that the blind man's case was of precisely similar nature.

What are the "works of God" in a mortal man? Are they not essentially to overthrow and cast out Satan and sin, with all the corruption and taint of evil? But it may be said that the words mean that God's power might be shown. Indeed! Is this all? Why select a man? Would not the "power" of God have been much more plainly manifested by some unquestionably miraculous work in nature. Suppose Christ had actually done what he told his disciples was possible to faith—plucked up a mountain and cast it headlong into the sea—would not the mere question of power have been settled much more positively than

in healing the sick? A thousand other wonders would have displayed power; but Jesus "*came to seek and save the lost.*" Who can dare say that this man would ever have been saved, if he had been born with eyes? Had he not known such desperate privation, would he have ever believed in the Son of God?

Beyond question, he stands as an example of God's love and grace. Bound by Satan, not merely for eighteen years, but all his life; deprived of the precious boon of sight, and feeling his helplessness, as only the blind can; he meets the Great Physician. The beautifully significant words, "as long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world," sounded in his ears; the divine hand touched his eyes, and the command followed, "go, wash in the pool of Siloam." He went, he washed, he saw. A trial of faith followed, and then his spiritual eyes were also opened, and he exclaimed, in adoring confidence, "Lord, I believe."

A significant thought is here presented. Modern experience confirms the record in the fact, that *a wondrous spiritual blessing invariably accompanies the healing by faith.* In the long years of the faith work at Mänedorf, at Bad Boll, under Dr. Cullis, and with many others, this has proved the universal rule. No one ever trusts God for anything without being blessed in spirit. And this is what we might expect, for is not faith laid down in Scripture as the express channel of communication between God and man?

We see, therefore, that, while the blindness was not a punishment for any special offence, it most certainly was no exception to the rule, that sickness emanates from the devil, and exists on account of sin. It saved this man from his sins, just as the thorn saved Paul from falling into pride, and the boils brought Job to the actual death of self. And thus, in each case, the works of God were manifested, in *destroying the works of the devil.*

5.—Lazarus.

In the eleventh chapter of John we have a very similar case. Christ loved Lazarus. Is it possible that God allows the works of the devil to afflict those whom He loves? It is written, "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth." Some one will say, "you have quoted a verse that weighs directly against you this time." Have I? On the contrary the Lord gives me to see in it a mighty argument in my favor. I ask, how does the Lord chasten his children? We know that it is by trials, tribulations, sorrows, and sickness if you please. But whence come these? Do not trials come from the opposition of sinners? My patience is tried by somebody's impatience. My love is tested by another's ugliness and hatred. My faith is used in repelling the doubts which Satan interjects. Is it not perfectly plain that the things which give us by far the greater portion of our "chastening," unquestionably emanate from sin and Satan?

Why, how could we be "chastened" if we lived in an angelic community, where Satan's cloven foot could not tread? Will anybody try to explain? And are we to conclude that sickness is to be arbitrarily separated from all the other ills that flesh is heir to, and ascribed to the direct agency of "Him who hath loved us and bought us with His blood?" We all believe that whatever the punishments of perdition may be, they will be directly under the hand of the prince of darkness. Then how horrible it is to imagine that He, who is love, actually swings the scourges of hell in order to punish His own children.

If you say you do not believe God does that, then our position is granted at once. These things are all unquestionable evils. Now they do not send themselves. And if God does not send them, the devil must do so. The whole difficulty is cleared by simply regarding the double character of God. He is justice, but He also is love. "We have all sinned, and come short of the glory of God." Therefore we are all under judicial sentence. This is our present condition. But love intervenes, and temporarily suspends execution. Meanwhile the "roaring lion" is raging around the "hedge" which God "hath set about" us; and claiming us as his own. He is constantly striving to break through and slay us forever. But God withholds him by His mighty hand. Now we are either out-breaking sinners, or like Job, we do not "follow on to *know* the Lord" as He would have us. In this state of affairs Love asks the aid of

wisdom and God, apparently listening to Satan's taunt of unfair protection, withdraws the hedge, and says, "Behold he is in thine hand, *but save his life.*" At once the darts fall thick and fast. It may be the loss of family and of fortune, or it may be bitter personal pain. The arch-enemy has not learned backward since he displayed his ingenuity in the land of Uz. He has the "power of death," and he uses it *just as far as God will let him.* If the "hedge" is not withdrawn from the body, he must be content with spoiling the goods, blowing down the house, and sending fire upon the sheep. Men were ready to ascribe Satan's work to God three thousand years ago, for Job's servants said, "The fire of God is fallen from heaven;" when the fact is it was the *fire of hell*, sent by Satan himself. I have not a shadow of a doubt that if God would only withdraw the "hedge" about the human race, the devil would kill every single soul upon earth in an hour. He would kill the saints out of pure malignity, and to prevent their serving God; and he would kill the sinners to make sure of their damnation.

An ancient tradition says that when man was created "in the image of God," all angels and created beings were called upon to do him honor, as the most remarkable work of God. But Eblis, or Satan, revolted at the command, became a prey to envy and hatred, and rebelling against God, was cast down from his high estate, carrying his followers with him. Certain it is, that the old legend holds an important truth. It is the undying

hatred, and venomous, sleepless animosity which Satan has ever displayed towards our race.

Job's case was not an exception, but rather, almost, if not quite, the rule.

In this view of the matter, how plain does the case of Lazarus become! Jesus loved him; therefore he needed chastening. For some reason sickness was allowed. Satan had full swing, and the dart was dipped in deadly venom. Lazarus died, and hell rejoiced that a friend of the Nazarene was slain. Satan has no foreknowledge, he is but a creature, and cannot read God's purposes in advance. But "this sickness was not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby." The word went forth, the works of the devil were destroyed, and Lazarus came back to life. Note especially, that Jesus said, "I am glad for your sakes that I was not there, to the intent ye may believe." What did this mean, but that, if He had been with the afflicted one, His presence would have necessarily banished sickness from one who loved Him, and whom He loved; and mark, how great spiritual blessings came to them who stood by. "Then many of the Jews which came to Mary, and had seen the things which Jesus did, believed on him."

And finally we see again, permanently displayed in this chapter, the great truth that God maketh "the wrath of man (or devils) to praise him." Ps. lxxvi. 10. It is in this light that we can read of Pharaoh, of whom it is said that God especially raised him up. Rom. ix. 17. The reason of

the raising up was that God might show forth His power, and declare His name through all the earth. But was not Pharaoh a fearful sinner, given over to the entire power of Satan? And how did God show forth His power? Was it not by destroying the reign of Pharaoh over His people, and by drowning Pharaoh himself in the midst of the sea? The more we look into the Scriptures, the more we become convinced that the way God gets to Himself glory, is by saving and delivering His children *from* evil, and not merely by giving grace to remain under bondage *to* evil. Jesus Christ came "*to save His people from their sins.*"

The method by which God *sends* evil, and disease and trial, and tribulation, and distress, and peril, and sword, is outlined or suggested in the words of the Prophet, "Ephraim is joined to idols, *let him alone.*" Hos. iv. 17. And we see the same thought in the dying words of Joseph, "But as for you, ye thought evil against me: but God meant it unto good, to bring to pass, as it is this day, to save much people alive." Gen. l. 20. But most conclusive of all, is it not manifest that God saw fit to give us salvation through sin? *In the proper sense*, this is most tremendously true. It was sin that rejected Jesus of Nazareth; it was sin that nailed Him to the cross; it was sin and death and hell that rejoiced in the darkness of Calvary. But God "meant it for good, to bring to pass as it is to-day, *to save much people alive.*" Of course if there had been no sin, Jesus would not have given Himself for us; but sin there was, and beyond all

controversy, Christ could not have died, except by the works of the devil, the great representative of sin. But Jesus did not triumph by *remaining* under the power of sickness or sin. He conquered death and hell by destroying their power over Him, and living in health and strength until the time for His departure drew nigh. And he wants us to walk, even as He walked. Heb. ii. 14, 15.

6.—Death Appointed to All.

People often say, "Well if all this is true, nobody will ever die." There are several answers to this thoughtless and really ignorant remark. First we are told that "all men have not faith." Christ himself asked, "When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?" "O ye of little faith, wherefore did ye doubt?" is the query that finds very wide application to-day. When it is apparent that a mere handful in the world can manage to trust God for healing, it is at once seen that the objection is inconsequential. But the real thought goes deeper than the words. The idea is, how will a man, who does exercise faith for healing, ever manage to die? A moment's reflection makes this clear. The very essence of healing, as of holiness, through faith, is *God's will*. When Jesus so wonderfully cured my heart disease, it was done *after* I had resigned all to the will of God. I said, if God wants me to die, then I *desire* to die. If He wants me to live and suffer, I desire to do so. But if he wants me to recover and praise Him, I desire that. But I only desire the

glory of God. In this attitude before God I was led to see His will in my recovery, and God alone is glorified thereby. But to-day how is it? I am living for His glory, and am ready by His grace, at a moment's notice to depart and be with Jesus. With Paul I can say "to be with Christ is far better." The man whose whole being is given to Jesus, will not seek to live, when God's time has come to carry him over the river. The heart that is all the Lord's has its treasure in heaven, and waits, almost impatiently, for the Lord's appearing. Such a man is fully satisfied with life on earth, and like Paul, it is only by God's grace that he is content to stay there. His whole conversation is in heaven, from whence also he looks for the Lord Jesus. The very sweetest sound in all this wide universe, to a heart full of the love of the Master, is the welcome call, "Behold the bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet him." Lord hasten the day when Jesus shall come and "we which are alive and remain be caught up to meet him in the air." "Amen! even so come Lord Jesus." Of course I do not expect the world to comprehend this, for these things are spiritually discerned. But all God's children ought to understand.

"It is appointed unto men once to die, and after that the judgment."—Heb. ix. 27. No one seeks to evade this Scripture. But we know that God will give deliverance in death itself. The story of Esther beautifully sets forth this deliverance. The laws of the Medes and Persians cannot alter, but the King authorizes the Jews to stand for

their lives; and by this permission, as well as for the fear of Mordecai, who stood before the King in the place of his people, the day of the edict brings victory, although the law is not repealed. So Jesus stands for us, making intercession for us. The law of death cannot be changed; but even in that dark hour, He gives strength to cry, "O grave where is thy victory! O death where is thy sting."

But there is no Scripture which even hints at the *necessity* of sickness coming upon God's children, who are walking in the light. If then it be finally asked, "Will you not have to be sick, in order to die," I answer, look about you. Is it true that all men die from illness? Go back to the apostles. Were they ill? Eleven died by violence, even as their Master; and of John the beloved, who will dare to say that he wasted away under the hand of a "messenger of Satan?" To-day, how many leave the world from violence, from accident, and from that sudden taking off without a day's suffering which is so common? How many old persons simply fail? The sands of life run out almost imperceptibly; they are not sick; but suddenly the golden cord is loosed, and the spirit departs to God who gave it. Surely this question is abundantly answered already.

7.—For the Apostolic Age.

We are told, with much confidence, that these miracles of healing were only for the Apostolic Age. This idea is of a piece with the theory that

all the miracles of Christ were wrought simply to establish a belief in His divinity. But it is no new idea that Christ performed these miracles out of His overflowing love and goodness. Dr. Nast, in his "Introduction to the Gospel Records," advances the thought that Jesus did not have to exert Himself to work miracles, but rather was obliged to restrain the outflow of life from His loving heart. As we have already seen, the Master could well have established His superhuman character by astounding miracles in nature; but His love for man, so to speak, compelled Him to heal and bless wherever He went.

But we are not left to theory and analogy; Scripture is not silent upon this subject. The last words of Jesus, according to St. Mark, were, "and these signs shall follow *them that believe*; in my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues: they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover."—Mark xvi. 17, 18. Now, "them that believe" is a pretty broad promise. If men and women rise up to-day and say, "We believe, and these signs do follow us," who will undertake to disprove the fulfilment of the Lord's words? Again, Paul, in 1 Cor. xii., speaks at length of the "gifts of the Spirit." He says, "God hath set some *in the church*, first, apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." Now we all believe that "teachers" ex-

ist in the church to-day; but if any of these gifts were restricted to the Corinthians of the first century, we can not consistently claim a single one. Moreover Paul enjoins the church to "covet earnestly" these very gifts. Does that look like a special apostolic privilege?

But James settles the matter beyond any successful dispute. He writes "to the twelve tribes scattered abroad," that is surely general enough. And he gives a direction to the sick, *which for clear cut specific detail is not surpassed by any promise in the Bible.* "Is any sick among you (Is that sufficiently comprehensive?) let him call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him."—Jas. v. 14, 15. Now if any man can point to a plainer and more positive promise in the Bible, than this to the sick, let him produce it.

I make the positive assertion that the following cannot be denied by any man living:

1. There is no law in the Old Testament laid down with more distinctness and positiveness than the law of physical health through the healing power of Jehovah Rophi.—Ex. xv. 26.

2. There is no command with attached promise, more absolute, than the commission to the apostles. —Matt. x. 1, 7, 8. To the seventy disciples.—Luke x. 1–9. And to the entire church.—Mark xvi. 17, 18.

3. There is no command and no promise more general in its application, nor more unqualified in its terms, than the direction to the sick.—Jas. v. 14, 15.

4. There is not a sentence, a word, or even a hint, anywhere in Scripture that either of these were confined to any special age, or to be limited by any particular conditions. Each expresses its own conditions.

I am fully persuaded that any Christian, who prayerfully considers these four points, will speedily be convinced that God's promises are not outlawed by time. Let as not forget the curse pronounced against him who shall add to, or take from the words of Scripture.—Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

8.—The Days of Miracles Have Passed.

This objection is really already answered. It only remains to say, that this proverb was coined in hell, and bears the most unmistakable signs of the devil's imprint. The Bible covers a period of four thousand years of actual history. During all that time God wrought special miracles. Looking forward into the future, the seer of Patmos pictures miracle on miracle, wonder upon wonder, until the mind can scarcely follow the letter, much less the sense. These were to come. We are now trembling on the very verge of the glorious appearing of our Lord and King—a miracle more stupendous in its effects than any that the world has known. Who says the days of miracles are no more? Who will dare to say it? Is it written?

Is there the least intimation in the Word? Does not Paul say "Covet earnestly the best gifts," after naming the gift of miracles fourth in order? I could bring modern evidence of the weightiest kind, but we are dealing with God's Word alone.* Is it not plain that a sleeping church has "made the Word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered?" Mark vii. 13. Jesus Christ is "the same, yesterday, to-day, and forever." Heb. xiii. 8.

9.—The Use of Means.

Has not God provided physicians, medicine, and means for healing the sick? These questions need but little thought, though they may require some space. I am writing to Christians, as to those who believe God's Word. Hence, the great question is, what does the Word say? That is enough. But let us look at this question of means.

We have already seen how exceedingly uncomplimentary the Bible is to physicians. The word medicine occurs only four times in Scripture. One is "Thou hast no healing medicines." Jer. xxx. 13. Another, "In vain shalt thou use many medicines." Jer. xlvi. 11. Another where Ezekiel speaks in his vision of the tree of life whose leaf should be "for medicine." Ezek. xlvii. 12. And the fourth, "a merry heart doeth good (like) a medicine." Prov. xvii. 22. The margin has it "to

* Let the reader examine the evidence in "*Supernatural gifts of the Spirit*," *Pastor Blumhardt*, Dr. Cullis' "*Faith Cures*" etc. etc.

a medicine." Of course these are largely figurative; and I admit freely that these brief words plainly indicate that remedies were known and used at the time they were written. But it is certainly strange that not one single case is even *mentioned* in the Bible, where any man was healed of disease; solely by the use of medicines. This is not surprising however to the soul that has learned to literally believe, "It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in man." *Scripture never advises us to trust in anybody or anything but God.* There are several cases in the Bible where something of the nature of physical means seem to have been employed.

1. TIMOTHY. Paul wrote, "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities." The word is *oinos*, *grape juice.* Dr. Boardman presents the argument that this was no more advising medicine, than would be the counsel to eat rare beef-steak, since wine was regarded as a provision for nourishment.* This is undoubtedly true of the sweet unfermented wines, which, like the famous Lesbian variety, were according to Pliny, more highly esteemed than any other, except by those who drank to get drunk.

Paul reminds Timothy twice of the "gift" which he had received.† From all analogy we must conclude that Timothy, in common with the seventy, the deacons, and "them that believed," healed the sick, while he preached the gospel; for

* *Great Physician* p. 107.
† 1 Tim. iv. 14. 2 Tim. i. 6.

this was the distinct commission. But if he was seriously and permanently ill, would not the proverb which Jesus quoted, have been flung in his teeth, "Physician heal thyself?" Again Paul says, "Thou, therefore, my son, be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus."—2 Tim. ii. 1. And he charged him to "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season," etc. Surely the apostle did not count on any interference from sickness. If we can imagine Paul and Peter, after their day's work in preaching and healing, soaking their feet in mustard and hot water, and swallowing black draughts or liver pills, we can then easily conceive of Timothy's taking medicine in any proper sense of the word. Why didn't Paul send him a "handkerchief" or an "apron," if he was sick and needed healing? See Acts xix. 11, 12. This case gives no more argument against faith-healing, that it does against total abstinence.

2. HEZEKIAH. The good king was "sick unto death." 2 Kings. 20. Isaiah came and told him he must die. But Hezekiah wept and prayed, and before Isaiah had crossed the court yard, the word of the Lord came to return, and promise the King fifteen years of life. "And Isaiah said, take a lump of figs. And they took and laid it on the boil, and he recovered."—vs. 7. Without any discussion whatever, as to the possible medicinal properties of figs, when used as a "plaster," I note the following telling points. In vs. 5. God said "I have heard thy prayer, *I will heal thee.*" Then the Lord gave a most miraculous sign to confirm faith

in the promise that the third day the King should go up to the house of the Lord. The shadow went backward on the dial of Ahaz ten degrees. Hezekiah prayed. God answered. God said He would do the healing, and add fifteen years of life. The fig medicine (?) would not have been used, but for the mandate of the prophet. Hezekiah evidently put no confidence in the plaster, but asked for a miraculous sign from God. God gave this also, and raised him up according to the promise. This recalls the case I cited of the lady who was impressed to use Poland water. I consider it a perfectly fair suggestion to physicians, who really believe that the figs cured Hezekiah, that they apply similar plasters to every fatal carbuncle they encounter. I do not dream of sneering at any man's profession, or any man's faith in making this suggestion; but if figs cured carbuncles in the days of Isaiah, they will do the same to-day. But let us remember that Hezekiah was cured in three days.

3. The Blind Man. "Jesus spat on the ground and made clay of the spittle and anointed his eyes." Here again was a semblance of means. But does any one seriously suppose that the clay had any part whatever in restoring sight to a man who was "*born blind?*" Spittle and earth are plenty and cheap. Have they ever healed anybody else? If we look rightly, we see here but another example of those tests of humility and of obedience, which God so often sees fit to send. The common dirt, and the almost repulsive saliva,

sharply teach the great lesson that he who would be healed by God, must be content to accept God's way, *no matter how humiliating that way may seem to the natural heart.* Cæsar's famous letter is far outdone in the simple, humble, obedient testimony, "I went, I washed, I saw." This case is very similar to that of the great Syrian General.

4. NAAMAN. We all know the story of his healing. How he heard of the "Prophet in Israel," went to the King, was sent to Elisha, terribly offended at the humiliating treatment he received, and wrathfully refused to bathe in Jordan. Did the prophet think him a fool? Were not Abana and Pharpar better than Jordan? Now anyone can see that the water of Jordan had no possible virtue as a medicine; that Naaman thought he knew better than Elisha what should be done; that he was haughty, proud and *unbelieving.* But to apply the story to ourselves to-day, is not so easy for the natural heart. Yet no better illustration can be found.

I boldly assert that the real trouble with those Christians who refuse to accept faith-healing, is that the characteristics of the old general of Syria are literally reproduced in them. 1. They think they are wiser than the Word of God. 2. They are too proud to give up every trace of self, and obey without a question. 3. Most important of all, *they will not believe.* As soon as Naaman made up his mind to give up his pride and obey, he was healed. The same road is open to-day. Note especially that spiritual blessings attended the

bodily healing, and Naaman became a worshipper of the true God. Nor should we forget that Jesus himself referred to this very case, and said in so many words, that the only reason why other lepers were not healed was because of their unbelief. Is this the reason why so many languish to-day?

I believe this covers every case of healing in the Bible where anything approaching the nature of medicine was used, except those whom the disciples "anointed with oil."—Mark vi. 13. This brings us fairly to the question,

5. WAS OIL IN ANY SENSE A MEDICINE? Notwithstanding the opinion of the learned Dr. Adam Clarke, it is with difficulty that I can seriously debate this point. We can easily find refuge against Dr. Clarke in the decided stand taken by John Wesley in opposition to the great commentator on this point. In the matter of authority I will simply place Wesley against Clarke. The latter thought the oil was used as a medicine; the former utterly rejected the idea.

In John Wesley's Journals we read numerous accounts of healing in answer to prayer.

"My old disorder returned as violent as ever. A thought came into my mind, 'Why do I not apply to God in the beginning, rather than in the end of my illness?' I did so and found immediate relief, so that I needed no further medicine.

"My horse was exceeding lame, and my head ached more than it had done for some months. (What I here aver is the naked fact. Let every man

account for it as he sees good.) I then thought, 'Cannot God heal either man or beast, by any means, or without any?' Immediately my weariness and headache ceased, and my horse's lameness in the same instant; nor did he halt any more either that day or the next. A very odd accident this also.

"When I came home they told me the physician said he did not expect Mr. Myrick would live till morning. I went to him, but his pulse was gone. He had been speechless and senseless for some time. A few of us immediately joined in prayer. (I relate the naked fact.) Before we had done, his sense and speech returned. Now, he that will account for this by natural causes, has my free leave; but I choose to say, 'This is the power of God.'

"I was desired to visit one who was eminently pious, but had now been confined to her bed for several months, and was utterly unable to raise herself up. She desired us to pray that the chain might be broken. A few of us prayed in faith. Presently she rose up, dressed herself, came down stairs, and I believe had no further complaint." *

But we do not have to ask either of these men. Our eyes are open; we can read for ourselves. What does God say? We find eight or nine Hebrew, and half a dozen Greek words translated by *anoint*, *anointed*, *anointing*. This word, in its

* Wesley also relates the instantaneous healing of cancer in both breasts in the case of one Mary Speciah.—Howitt II. p. 389.

three English forms, occurs 137 times in Scripture. It is sufficient to note that all but four or five of these clearly and directly refer to the sacred or ritualistic anointing, or consecrating to God in some manner. A large number refer to the "anointing oil" of the Mosaic law. Many others speak of the anointing of kings, and others of prophets. Yet it is noticeable that several of these words mean literally, *to smear or to rub on.* The particular word which is used in James v. 14, is precisely the same as in Mark vi. 13. It is *aleipho*, and means distinctly, *to anoint.* Three other Greek words, *engchrio*, *chrio* and *epichrio*, have more the sense of *to rub on.* Yet the latter are used in such texts as "God anointed (chrio) Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power."—Acts x. 38. See also 1 John ii. 27. The word *chrisma* is here used. It is perfectly plain, therefore, that there is not the faintest Scriptural ground for making even the conjecture that the oil was used for its supposed medical properties. On the contrary the evidence against such an idea is absolutely unbroken, and stands 137 to 1. We do know that everyone or everything that was specially set apart or consecrated to the Lord's service was anointed with oil. Was this to cure the disease of sin? And when we find Jesus himself commanding his disciples to preach the gospel, for the saving of souls by faith alone, and to heal the sick by the laying on of hands and anointing with oil, and find that an inspired apostle connects this healing with the

forgiveness of sin, what can we believe or suppose as to the use of the oil? Besides, James most distinctly says, "The Lord shall raise him up." In short, there is not the faintest hint in Scripture that oil was ever considered in any other light than the symbol of consecration. For the benefit of those who ask for human authority we will now turn to history.

I lately read an article by a minister of the gospel in which it was stated that oil was about the only medicine the physicians used in the time of Christ, or at least that it was exceedingly prominent. Such a statement can only proceed from inexcusable ignorance in the writer.

We find in the Homeric poems abundant evidence that at that early day medicine, as a science, was by no means a new thing. "And there is no sign given of the subordination of medicine to religion, nor were priests charged with medical functions . . . circumstances which throw grave doubts on the commonly received opinion that medicine derived its origin in all countries from religious observances."* Hippocrates the Great (B. C. 460) is looked upon as the father of medicine. He was a voluminous writer, a close observer, and a skilful physician. He mentions no less than *two hundred and sixty-five drugs* in his various works, besides many dietary and surgical remedies or methods. This is sufficient of itself to completely overthrow the absurd idea that oil was the great remedy for disease. In all chronic cases Hippocrates chiefly relied upon diet, exercise and such natural methods.

* *Encyclopædia Britannica.*

After him, arose the two schools under Herophilus of Chalcedon, a profound anatomist, and a renowned physician, and his rival Erasistratus. Alexandria, the seat of learning, received the followers of both, and was the scene of a long controversy between them. Erasistratus and his disciples "employed a great variety of drugs." * After these arose the Empiric school (280 B. C.); whose physicians were "extremely successful in practical matters, especially in surgery and in the use of drugs, and a large part of the routine knowledge of diseases and remedies which became traditional in the times of the Roman Empire is believed to have been derived from them." †

Asclepiades, the friend of Cicero (born 124 B. C.), founded a system known as "methodism." His knowledge of disease and surgical skill were very considerable. In the treatment of sickness he laid great stress upon "diet, exercise, passive movements or frictions, and the external use of cold water,—in short a modified athletic training." This is surely sufficient to convince the most skeptical that oil was only one of hundreds of remedies, current among the physicians of the time.

But let us look at it in the light of common sense. Suppose it true that the oil was to be well rubbed on as an actual remedy. Are we not confronted with the absurdity that an inspired Apostle and Jesus himself ordered a medicine to be universally used, which in many cases would prove only an aggravation? Imagine rubbing oil upon an

* *Encyclopædia Britannica.* † *Ibid.*

open sore or an inflamed eye! Of what use to rub oil upon the skin in order to cure the vast array of deep-seated internal disorders which cannot be possibly reached in that way? And why should the Apostle ignore the hundreds of remedies, known and used all around him? Why did he not say—*use appropriate medicines*, then lay on hands and pray, and the Lord shall raise him up? These questions answer themselves.

The laying on of hands was also eminently ritualistic and symbolical. Beyond doubt, physical manipulation and rubbing were used as remedies, but the evidence is wholly against any such sense in the case of healing. Why did the Apostles "lay hands" on the disciples at Samaria? Acts. viii. 17, and at Ephesus? Acts xix. 6. See also Acts vi. 6, ix. 17, xiii. 3, 1 Tim. iv. 14, v. 22, 2 Tim. i. 6. The whole tenor of Scripture establishes beyond controversy that this was a sacred rite, intended to convey the idea of a distinct impartation from a divine source.

But has not God allowed medicines to be discovered for a good purpose? Undoubtedly. Medicines and physicians are signs of God's love. Foreseeing that "all men have not faith," and that only a small percentage of the sick will exercise trust in Him, He has provided these means for stemming the tide of disease, and thereby alleviating sufferings, while also extending the day of probation to millions.

But is it not true that "faith without works is dead?" And ought I not try to help myself, while

at the same time trusting in God as the real fountain of power? I reply that "Providence is on the side of the heaviest artillery" may do for a Napoleon, but not for a Christian; and when the latter quotes "God helps those who help themselves" in matters of faith, he is treading dangerously near to the great Frenchman's maxim.

"Faith without works is dead." True. But the kind of works God calls for is best expressed in this—*acting precisely as if you believed every word of God's promise. It is a great deal more* WORK *to go to Jordan without a question, than to essay "some great thing."*

But do you not believe in any means at all, under any circumstances? Yes. At all times, and under all circumstances, go to the best and most successful physician ever known—Jesus of Nazareth, and use the *Scriptural means for healing the sick.*

1. LAYING ON OF HANDS.
2. ANOINTING WITH OIL.
3. PRAYER OF FAITH.

In the LAYING ON THE HAND of power, I see suggested the Almighty Father, the fountain and source of life. In the ANOINTING I find set forth the blessed influences of the Holy Spirit, drawing, regenerating, cleansing and applying all the benefits of grace to soul and body. And in the PRAYER OF FAITH, I discover the living Word, the glorious Son of God, my Lord and Master Jesus Christ, through whose name, by faith in his name, we are enabled to stand before the world and before God as monuments of Redeeming Love. Praise the Lord!

10.—Who are the Elders.

This question often takes the form of an objection. Some one says, Why cannot I pray for myself? You can; and if God lays it on your heart, do so, by all means. Cases have greatly multiplied, in the last few years, where different people have been led to trust God for physical healing, and have been raised up through faith. Some of these have been circulated far and wide by the secular press. But there can be no doubt that these are exceptions, so to speak. The great mass of cures have come in the literal obedience of the plain command, "Is any sick . . . let him call," etc.

Several years ago, I talked long and earnestly on this subject with a gentleman, who was afflicted with chronic disease. He believed in my healing, accepted the fact of God's power working in these matters, and desired to throw himself on the promises. But he seemed doubtful on this point of the "Elders." He said, "Why can't I call for any of the good brethren here to pray with me? There is Brother C—— and Brother P——, and others; why not call on them? They have faith in God, and are about the best men I know." I replied, "My dear friend, they have not the special kind of faith required, and they do not feel at all called to pray in this way. Dr. Cullis does feel called, and the Lord has honored his prayers." I strongly advised him to go on to Boston and claim the promise in humble obedience. He seemed much impressed, and I hoped he would go. But he lin-

gered and hesitated. Three or four years passed away in this manner; and then, in a moment, he was summoned away from earth. I do not pretend to assert that he died because he would not go to Boston, but I do certainly know that he was decidedly averse to straightforward, simple obedience to the command, "Let them call for the elders of the church," etc.

There can be no reasonable doubt that "the elders" are those whom God has called to this special work. And just as a man should not enter the ministry without a distinct call from God, so no one should undertake to act as an "elder" in this matter of healing, unless he is perfectly sure that the Lord has called him to the work. At the same time I most emphatically believe in any one who has faith, acting in emergencies. For a man to lay on hands and anoint with oil in the name of the Lord, without faith, would be a mockery. Is then every minister of the gospel called upon to pray with the sick? Yes, *if he has faith;* faith for that special work. He has no business to preach the gospel if he has not positive faith for results, seen or unseen. And he has no right to pray with the sick, without expectant faith. Nor has anyone. As a matter of plain fact, there are hundreds of men and women in Christendom to-day, whose prayers, according to James v. 14, have been repeatedly answered in the healing of all manner of diseases. I am personally acquainted with a large number of these earnest servants of God, and know of the results of their work.

11.—Gifts of Healing.

But do you believe that anybody has such a thing as a special gift of healing in these days? Most certainly I do. This point was lately held up to ridicule by a prominent clergyman, in a well-known religious paper. I wrote him a letter privately, and gave him some real information concerning well-attested facts. He responded with a short letter, part of which I here transcribe, as the best possible presentation of the real reasons for the rejection of faith-healing by so many good Christian people. I do not feel that I am violating any confidence in so doing, as the writer had already publicly attacked the doctrine, in very similar language. He says:

Oct. 1883.

"My Dear Brother:—

Thanks for your frank and friendly letter. All sane Christians believe that God hears prayer and, when it pleases Him, can and does restore the sick to health. What I utterly *disbelieve* is that He confers this miraculous gift of healing on the 'Brother P—s' and other special wonder-workers at Boston, Old Orchard, and elsewhere. The best proof that Brother P. really did nothing for Mrs. M. is that he if he really *could* do all she asserts, he would have become the most celebrated and *sought-after* of men; whereas he only remains an obscure 'Evangelist.' The woman's idea of sending for 'Bro .P.' in order to 'do God's way,' is ridiculous. If *he* (or any man) can by 'anointing' and prayer, raise the sick—then God has given him special Apostolic powers, and it is absurd to suppose that 'Bro. P.—' would *fail* to exercise that miracle-working power upon thousands. The trouble is that your theory builds an *immense* presumption on a few sporadic cases. Bro. Gordon is an admirable man, but his devout volume* fails to convince me, or nine-tenths of the intelligent ministers of the land.

* *Ministry of Healing.* Dr. A. J. Gordon of Boston.

The *special* gifts of those special servants of God, the Apostles, *ceased* with them. The legitimate function of believing, submissive prayer, is almost caricatured in such cases as the preposterous little pamphlet you sent me. If Mrs. M. *can* do what she describes, *why* does she not do it *oftener*, and in cases of eminent and specially valuable lives? The immense number of *failures* go for nothing with good people of your 'school.'

In haste and with cordial respect,

Yours in Christ Jesus,

——— ———."

I have given it all. It answers itself, to a devout and truly humble Christian. May the dear Jesus mercifully spare this servant the "woe to the shepherds of Israel," who teach not the truth! But let us look at his letter. He specially disbelieves in "gifts." And the "proof" is that, if Bro. P. could do what is claimed, he would be famous, "sought-after," and not an "obscure 'evangelist.'" These gifts perished "with the Apostles." Our brother should read and ponder upon 1 Cor. xii. He will find that all these "gifts" were broadcast "in the church." He should read history. He will find that they were *common* in the church for four centuries after Christ. As to the point of fame etc., he should remember that "not many mighty men" are called, but that God hath used the weak things of the world to put to nought the great. He should remember, that while Jesus and the Apostles were "sought-after," it was only by the "common people," and by the sick who "had need of healing." "Nine-tenths of the intelligent ministers" of the day would not have anything to do with Christ, or any of His Apostles. "Have any

of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him?" Jno. vii. 48. If this dear brother would take a pilgrimage to Boston he would find Dr. Cullis besieged by the sick for two hours, five days in the week. In Connecticut he would find an humble colored woman "sought-after" continually. Crossing the ocean, he would find dear old Dr. Boardman with a full household of sick, seeking healing. At Karl Andreas' home he would meet with some of the most astounding facts in modern history. At Bad Boll, near Stuttgardt, he would find Pastor Blumhardt's son, at the head of a vast establishment, which, for more than thirty years, has been crowded with guests from all portions of the world, all looking for the miraculous healing power of God. And at Mānedorf in Switzerland he would see Samuel Zeller, in charge of the great faith work, established by the simple-hearted Dorothea Trudel. Perhaps the "obscure evangelists" are more "sought-after" than our brother imagines.

Again he asserts that for the lady to send for Bro. P. "in order to do God's way is ridiculous." To this awful statement I reply: "*It is written*, 'is any sick among you, let him call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord."

"It is absurd to suppose that 'Bro. P.' would *fail* to exercise that miracle-working power upon thousands." It seems to me I read in the Book of the fact that the prophet Elisha, gifted with a "double portion" of his master's spirit, only healed one leper out of the "many that were in Israel." And

of many widows, who, when the heavens were shut up, failed to receive a visit from the "man of God.' Where shall Bro. P. find the "thousands" upon whom to exercise his "miracle-working power"? If the thousands are all as skeptical as our brother, it is plain that Bro. P. would not and could not be sent. And just here we see another special failure to apprehend the word "Sent." Does our brother suppose that Paul or Peter healed the sick, right and left, without any guidance at all from God? Does he suppose that anybody to-day claims a power as *his own*, that is, as his own possession or property, to be used according to his discretion? The very nature of the promise used limits the exercise to those who "call for the elders." And does he suppose that any very large percentage of the sick are willing to do anything of the kind? If he does, a little practical inquiry will soon undeceive him. If our brother should be taken sick, could any "elder" cure him? Would he "call"?

"Your theory builds an immense presumption on a few sporadic cases." My theory (I can say "my," even as Paul said "my gospel," for it is mine; my Jesus gave it to me) does not build on any case at all. It did, at first, because faith was very weak. But long ago I built not on the sand of human testimony, but on the Rock. The only foundation I lay for the doctrine and practice of faith-healing is, "It is written," and I joyfully affirm, that if every case of cure, with which I am familiar, were to be wiped out of existence, I would cry out, Lord I believe thy word. That grandly intelligent man, Sir

Thomas Erskine, found it possible to do this, without any human evidence.* "Blessed are they who have not seen and yet have believed."—Jno. xx. 29.

"Why does she not do it oftener, and in cases of eminent and specially valuable lives?" This has already been partly answered. As to the "valuable" and "eminent" lives; I ask, who says they are eminent and valuable? God, or man? If they are valuable enough to God to have them raised up, depend upon it, it will be done. The ten spies were eminent men in Israel, and the entire nation considered them valuable men, but God thought only Caleb and Joshua, the most unpopular men out of three millions, were "valuable" enough to live. The ten died because they "brought up a slander on the land," which God had told them to possess.

"The immense number of *failures* go for nothing with good people of your 'school.'" Well, praise the Lord! they should count for nothing. We should not be discouraged if we prayed with a thousand and every one died. I am not dodging in the least. I have already shown that the foundation of the doctrine is God's Word, *and not results*. He has said, "My word shall not return unto me void." That is enough for me. Our brother has preached more sermons from which he has seen no positive results, than those which have been *visibly* instrumental in healing souls. Do these "failures go for nothing" with him? Was the

*See *The Brazen Serpent*.

trouble with God, or with him, or with the sinners? Did he ever labor with a number of inquirers, and see some emerge into the light, while many others slid back into darkness? Yet did these "failures" cause him to doubt the doctrine of soul-healing?

The dear Lord knows that there is in my heart only the kindest and most loving feelings towards this brother, and towards all Christians, in this matter. But I mean to be as severe with *error* as I can find words, means and grace. It is the *error* solely, and not the man that, by the grace of God, I strive to strip of its plausible dress, and reveal in all its naked hideousness and deformity.

Here I must make another personal confession. After my own healing and sanctification, the thought of praying with others occasionally presented itself to me. I left it with the Lord, and bided His time. The day came when my own darling wife lay in puerperal fever, with a pulse running to *one hundred and eighty* in a minute. I ventured to lay hands on her in the name of the Lord, and to claim the promise in Mark xvi. 18. In an hour the fever had gone, the pulse was nearly normal, and the skin moist. Shall not Jesus have the praise? After this, for some time I had no call; but the matter lay upon my heart. Once I was asked to pray with a lady, and felt that I dared not refuse. God honored faith this time also. At length I felt a constant pressure or call upon the subject, and prayed long and earnestly for light and guidance. Walking alone

one day in the open country, the burden of my heart was, Lord, use me, if thou can's't, in this work. I have been healed, and the words keep ringing in my ears, "Freely ye have received, freely give." Lord send me. But then the words rose in my heart, as they had often done before, and I exclaimed aloud, "I am a man of unclean lips, and in the midst of a people of unclean lips; how can I be fit for such a work?" Suddenly I stopped short, and said aloud, "See here; the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from *all* sin; now do you believe it, or don't you believe it? Which?" For a moment I hesitated, and then, raising my eyes to heaven, I replied, "Lord I believe, Thou knowest that I do." "Then what are you talking about your unclean lips for?" How sharp and clear the question came! The heart works quickly under such pressure, and I answered steadily, "Master, I will never do so again. I do not understand it. It is a complete mystery how such a soul as mine can be *fit* for Thy service, but I will take Thy word for it, and believe it. Yes, I will even believe that my heart and my body are actually fit to be a temple of the Holy Ghost, and to receive the 'gifts' of the Spirit. Made so by the blood that cleanseth; how, I cannot comprehend, but fit for Thy service. Here I am Lord, send me."

In a few days I received a note from a lady, unknown to me, asking me to call on her for prayer for healing. I prayed earnestly that if the Lord had really given me what *He means* by "gifts of healing," that I might have a certain specific

sign while praying over this case. And in the event of this sign being given I solemnly promised never to doubt that God had really bestowed these "gifts" upon me. Suffice it to say that the sign asked for was distinctly given. From that day to this I have never entertained a doubt of God's "gifts." Praise the Lord! I have not been "called," very frequently, but that is a matter I leave with Jesus entirely. A single case will be all I can give here.

A man came to me, suffering intensely from a strange and complicated disease, which had absolutely baffled the combined skill of the physicians at the Jefferson hospital in Philadelphia. He had shortly before sought and obtained the blessing of a clean heart, and was rejoicing in the peace of God. After some conversation, I prayed with him, with anointing and laying on of hands. He had come to my house with difficulty, pale and covered with a clammy perspiration. As soon as the prayer was ended, he arose from his knees, grasped his hat, shook my hand and abruptly departed; going off with a vigorous step. He at once began to tell of his healing; and from that day to this, has not had a symptom of the disease. After six months of health, he got into spiritual trouble, and became dangerously ill with another complaint—heart disease. So serious was this that his physician left word at the church for special prayer in his behalf. When I visited him, he was lying on a lounge, gasping for breath. His pain had been so severe that he could not bear the weight of a sheet

upon his chest. His spiritual difficulties had been all removed, and his simple faith took hold of Jesus again as the Healer. After prayer, he sat up at once, and shortly amazed his physician and family beyond description by rising and going about his business. The next day he walked upwards of six or seven miles; and has been perfectly well ever since. According to his faith it has been unto him. Let Jesus have all the praise. Amen!

But how about the failures? I do not "count" either failures or healings. God keeps the books. It is my business to run His errands. He will take care of all results. "My Word shall not return unto Me void, but shall accomplish that whereunto it is sent." That is sufficient for me. We should never forget that the oxen may stumble without the least danger to the ark of testimony. If there was not a single recorded case of healing in history, I would stand on the promises of God, and declare them true.

12.—Casting Out Devils.

Another objection urged is, that if we take part of Mark xvi. 17, 18, we must take all; and in this case what will we say for the casting out of devils, drinking deadly things, etc., etc.?

The best reply to this is of course the Scriptural one. We can afford to lose those verses from Mark and throw ourselves upon that wonderful verse, which no man would ever have dared to imagine had Jesus omitted to utter it; "Verily, verily I say unto you, *He that believeth on me*, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works

than these shall he do, because I go unto my Father." Jno. xiv. 12. Notice this declaration is of "him that believeth on me." But do you mean to say that devils actually possess people to-day? Most certainly I do. Any doubter is referred to "Pastor Blumhardt"* or to "Supernatural gifts of the Spirit"* for modern evidence on this point.

Let me ask, who originated the idea that in these "practical times," the personal devil no longer takes possession of the bodies of men? Who suggested the thought that even the "possession" of Christ's day may have been only a form of insanity? I answer the personal devil himself is the author of both. What more natural for him than to use his best endeavors to divert men's attention from himself and his works? He well knows the first law of legerdemain—while doing one thing, talk about another, and thus fasten the spectators' eyes upon a false issue. Don't read Genesis; it records the original curse upon the serpent. If you do read it, make it all figurative. Don't read Revelation; it describes the final doom and punishment of Satan and his legions. It is all figure anyhow and you cannot understand it. Skip Ezekiel altogether; it deals in the next age of the world, and pre-supposes the curtailing of the devil's power. Read diligently of the "lying spirit in the mouth of Ahab's prophets," and never forget the original question of "free thought." "Yea, *hath* God said?" Is it not plain that this is all of a piece with the

* Willard Tract Repository.

lying influence which to-day preaches the gospel of materialism, and laughs at the supernatural in any form or dress? Satan is not dead. He is not tired. "He hath great wrath, knowing that his time is short." There are hundreds of men and women to-day, just as thoroughly and literally "possessed of a devil" as was the boy who was brought to Jesus, or the man in the tombs of Gadara. But, glory to God! "they that believe," shall and do cast them out, in the name of the living Jesus, who hath "all power in heaven and earth." I really believe that the real secret of many diseases which baffle the skill of physicians lies in this unnatural "possession." Medicine of course is worse than useless, and God's power is not invoked in simple faith. But the light is breaking through the clouds of doubt again, and God's power is being shown. Praise the Lord!

13.—Modern Thorns.

It may be pertinently asked whether the experience of those who believe for faith-healing ever coincides with the theory? Are there any modern "thorns in the flesh?" I suggest this question intentionally, as I wish to open every possible point to the light of God's truth.

Yes, there are many instances of "thorns." This serves to show that cases like Paul, and other Bible characters, are not rare exceptions, but rather types of a pretty general experience. Dorothea Trüdel herself carried a personal deformity; something of the nature of a crooked back. Samuel Zeller, who succeeded her at Mānedorf, is healthy

and strong, but his brother, who has great faith for others, is himself troubled with some ailment. Dr. Cullis is somewhat near-sighted. George O. Barnes has, or had a short time ago, defective sight. Mrs. Edward Mix was more or less threatened with throat affection. Miss Carrie Judd is exceedingly frail and delicate. Karl Andreas, I believe, is perfectly sound. I am acquainted with a great many others, some of whom have symptoms more or less frequent, from which they would like to be relieved.

I have thus frankly stated what may be considered to argue strongly against the doctrine set forth in this book; but I do not fear it. As I said long ago; this thing depends upon God's Word, not the testimony of man. God kept Moses to one hundred and twenty, without any other thorn than his real or imaginary slowness of speech; and the same God is alive to-day. Now, be it noticed, that in none of these modern cases has the "thorn" been of such a nature as to prevent incessant work for Jesus. These people were, or are, doing a prodigious amount of work; laboring in the most varied ways to spread the glad tidings of salvation. What then can be argued from the existence of these "thorns?" Certainly nothing against faith-healing in general, for every one of them has testified to the healing power in them. Dr. Cullis' eyes were seriously affected. He prayed about it, trusted Jesus for them, and has not been *troubled* since. Karl Andreas was cured of heart disease. Mrs. Mix was dying of consumption, and Miss

Judd of a complication of nervous and spiritual complaints; but both were healed, almost instantaneously. In fact, for me to mention one who has a "thorn," is to mention one who has been wondrously raised up through the "prayer of faith." The only point, therefore, which may seem to be affected by these experiences, is the one of exemption from sickness. Before discussing this I must speak of my own case. In Miracles of Healing, I related how I was led to trust God for my eye. Well, all these years He has kept me. I have used the eye constantly; teaching, reading and writing, and have never taken my glass out of the case to this day. Praise the Lord! But whenever I close my normal eye, I find the old defect or dimness in the sight still there. This indicates that the astigmatism remains. But at the same time it wonderfully speaks of God's power; for my physician said that unless relieved by the glass, my eye would always be unfit for use, and give me great pain. Since I trusted the matter to Jesus, however, I have used it as much as I pleased, and yet have not suffered any serious pain. Thus the Lord's power is constantly manifested in the continued miracle of healing, by which the natural consequences of using an astigmatized eye are entirely prevented. When both eyes are open my sight is very good, and I am concious of no defect whatever. So this "thorn" cannot be said to cause me any inconvenience at all. Nevertheless I have prayed for its removal, many times. I have earnestly besought God to give me some

indications, from the Word, that it is His will for me to retain it; but none such has ever been given. On the contrary, I have been directed to Scriptures as explicit as possible for absolute healing. Therefore I claim this, by faith in the promise. It is mine *potentially*, in God's Word; and I know it shall be in the physical fact. Meanwhile I keep constantly asking for light to see God's leading in the matter, and for apprehension to learn the lesson intended. When the lesson is fully learned I know I shall be free, even from this. Praise the Lord!

This very night, March 17, 1884, while correcting these pages, I testify to a glorious deliverance in this matter. The heavy reading of the last few days seemed to strain my eyes and they felt weary and threatened to give me trouble if I ventured to use them. But this work lay before me; I had the time, and could see no unreasonableness in the effort. After telling Jesus about it, and laying the whole thing in His hands, I was wonderfully blessed in spirit and felt greatly refreshed. I read all the evening and felt no pain. Praise the Lord!

This is the meaning of a "thorn," as I see it in God's Word. A lesson is to be taught, We are slow to learn, and often some slight affection is allowed in order to gain our attention. But the lesson learned, the thorn will be removed. Most certainly, if it in any way interferes with active work for the Master. For myself, I feel that I live on the Word of God. I never dreamed that I would ever see anything except a figure in that

Scripture, "man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God;" but now I apprehend that it may be literally true. Again and again I am worn out with work; human experience says, you must wait for a good night's rest, and that will restore you. A tired man must rest. But something presses in the Lord's work, and I go to the Word. "Himself took my infirmities and bore my sicknesses" literally, actually, positively gives me physical strength; and I feel better afterwards than if I had taken the suggested rest. I do not mean that all rules of health are discarded; quite otherwise. But I believe in doing what would be reasonable for a strong healthy man under the circumstances; and when the Lord *specially leads*, I believe in doing anything. At such times I realize most marvellously that I live upon the living Word. There is nothing between my soul and hell but Jesus' blood. There is nothing between my body and death but the power of Christ. I am thus peculiarly and doubly the Lord's, soul and body. Hallelujah!

Fanatical! I do not consider this worthy of a distinct place as an objection. The cry of fanaticism has ever been a favorite with the devil. He can scare good people with that very often, when other means fail him utterly. But it has ever been the cry against radical truth. All real truth is radical. The great trouble with the church of Christ to-day is that it is satisfied with half-truths half-experiences. Our religion professes to be an

"uttermost" religion, but *the church is sadly wanting in uttermost examples.* The quickest way to frighten many Christians is to urge them to believe God with that positive faith that assumes He means just what He says. Presumption! they say. What; presumption? Rather let us say it is presumption to take any place lower than the one assigned to us. A true child of God does not belong in the cellar, but on the house-top, and it is *presumption to stay anywhere else.* It presumes to know better than God, and it presumes on His mercy. O, beloved, let us take the place assigned to us, as children, at our Father's table and have perfect confidence that His blessed Word will feed us better than anything else in the universe.

So we are told that there are hyprocrites who are practising faith-healing purely to make money. This is sadly true. But what of it? Only this; it proves the existence of the real thing. The counterfeit always speaks of the genuine. Anti-Christs proves Christ always. "He maketh the wrath of men to praise him."

14.—Romanist Miracles.

We are asked how are we to distinguish between the true and the false; the evidence for the wonders at Lourdes and elsewhere is as direct as any given in modern Protestant faith-cures. What can be said about them?

Simply this. God always keeps His word, no matter who claims it. "According to your faith be it unto you," is just as true to a Romanist as a

Protestant. God has always "winked at" real unavoidable ignorance. When a Romanist goes to the grotto of Lourdes, and pleads with God for healing, if *faith in God* is exercised, healing comes of course. Make no mistake about this. God is no respecter of persons. He saved Rahab *out of heathen Jericho*, and healed the Syrian Naaman, simply because they believed in Him *up to the light they had*. Lest any should stumble at this, let me give positive evidence. Fortunately I am able to speak from knowledge.

In July 1883, Lieut. Emile Feffer, formerly instructor at St. Cyr, now a professor with me in the Pennsylvania Military Academy, visited Lourdes for the express purpose of examining into the matter. He and I had talked it over several months before, and I urged him to go to Lourdes if possible. He has great reason to believe in God, having been himself wonderfully preserved and healed in answer to prayer. To be brief, he went to Lourdes. Under the date of July 27, 1883, he wrote me as follows:

Four days ago I came to Lourdes with a few friends. We stopped for a moment before the grotto. There was a large gathering of people kneeling on the ground and praying, and in the midst of them was an invalid lady, seated in a small hand carriage. My curiosity was aroused, and I dismounted. I drew near and upon inquiry was told that the lady, for whom they were praying, was lame. I then returned home. During the evening I thought over the matter, and determined that I would watch this case. The next day, Tuesday 24th, I went to Lourdes by rail, and attended the same services, but this time taking part in them; with very little faith, however. The prayers were offered at three different stations; the second being about ten yards distance from the first, and the third

eighty yards from the second. When the party moved from the first to the second station, the lady said she felt like walking. She was helped out of her carriage and she walked the ten yards, sustained on either side by her attendants. At the next move she was not allowed to walk at all. I left Lourdes profoundly moved and interested. Next day I returned with the intention of seeing the final result. This morning, at ten o'clock, the service was held. The lady walked the first ten yards without any assistance, and then sat in her carriage during the prayers. When the next move began at eighty yards, she insisted upon walking, and she did walk alone the entire distance; entered the grotto, walked aronnd it (about twenty-five yards), sat down upon an ordinary chair, and after the service, walked out to her carriage, about thirty yards distant. These are facts which I saw. As soon as the crowd had dispersed somewhat, I approached the lady, as I desired to know the particulars from her own lips. I did not doubt her sincerity, for the emotion with which she prayed made me shiver. The lady is Madame Maitre, from Bordeaux. She said: "I have been ill for three years with an internal cancer, which has rendered me lame for the last eighteen months (incapable of walking). The physicians had exhausted every means, and declined to attempt an operation which would have certainly proved fatal. Two weeks ago I told my doctors that I would go to Lourdes, when they said that if I undertook such a trip I would die before reaching my destination. I replied that I would rather die than to live thus. So I came here; and now I am cured." I asked, *Do you believe the virgin Mary cured you by her own power?* "*Of course not,*" she replied, "but she interceded." She is an educated person, and I expected this answer. During the day I questioned more than fifteen persons, of all ages and conditions, on this point, and received the same reply.

Just after transcribing the above letter (Feb. 6, 1884), I had a long talk with my friend about his visit to Lourdes, last summer. He was thrilled through and through by the intense emotion displayed by the lady and her friends while praying; and satisfied beyond any question of their genuine

faith in the power of God. He heard and saw other interesting things at Lourdes, but this will suffice. Now of course there is no disputing the fact that in some cases false miracles have been advertised by dishonest priests for pecuniary ends. Any one who is familiar with Kirwan's famous letters to Archbishop Hughes will recall the evidence therein presented on this subject. Nevertheless it is supremely absurd, and decidedly unchristian, to assume that all Romanists are liars, and all priests swindlers. That there is an immense amount of devout and simple faith in the church of Rome is a fact perfectly familiar to every well-informed person; and as that faith really *centres* in God, we should not be surprised if it secures its reward. These people have been accustomed to believe that miracles still exist in their church; while we have been brought up on the proverb "the days of miracles have passed." They are therefore predisposed to believe in the supernatural. We are inclined to doubt everything but the material. However much of corruption there has been and is in the Romish church, she has certainly one virtue which ought to put us to shame—she has not thrown away the last words of Christ, "These signs shall follow them that believe." And wherever "*them that believe*" are found to-day, there is found the fulfilment of that word which can never pass away. This settles the whole controversy. Those who do God's will are they who "know of the doctrine." The skeptic never *knows* anything about God nor His word.

He *can not*, for all spiritual knowedge comes through simple faith and asks no questions. Before we undertake to limit God's love and power to our particular ideas, we had better remember Peter on the house-top, the Centurion's daughter, the Syro-phœnician woman, and other instances in Scripture, wherein God has taught that He is no respecter of persons, but always bestows upon man "according to his faith." O! let us "have faith in God!"

15.—Glorifying God in Sickness.

This is a most fertile objection. I have already treated it incidentally, and in the little tract "If it be Thy will," I endeavored to show its falsity more fully. To the query, can I not glorify God in sickness, I reply with another question. Can I glorify God in sin? How? By getting Jesus to deliver me from sin at once. But, you say, that is not exactly fair; does not God allow sickness as a sort of discipline? Ah! precisely. That is it exactly. So a father allows, or uses a whip as a "discipline." But what father or child esteems the whip in itself? Is it not an evil, so to speak? Who uses the whip a moment longer than is necessary to teach the lesson? Now I do beseech any one who may read these lines to consider this point. My brother if you claim that God wants you to continue in sickness for his glory, you proclaim before men, angels and devils, that you have not learned God's lesson, in spite of his efforts to instruct you. Your supposed humility then

really becomes genuine evidence of obstinacy. God is in a sense whipping you; and this process has been going on for a long time. You say you are glorifying God, by compelling Him to keep up the punishment. Now do you not think that the better way is to meekly and quietly learn the lesson; give up all, and take all in Jesus? Suppose your child had to be whipped every day at school, would you mention the castigation to your friends to show how beautifully the child set forth the just methods of the teacher? or would you strive to reduce the child to a state of obedience? When will you learn the lesson Saul missed, that "to obey is better than *sacrifice?*"

Again, this idea of "necessary discipline," involves the fatal error of supposing that my own personal development is the chief end of life, and that something else is needed besides the blood of Christ. Now "man's chief end is to glorify God, and to enjoy Him forever," *beginning now.* In order to glorify God, in the highest sense, we must be entirely His. But we become His not through the merit of our sufferings at all, but by the sufferings of Jesus. In other words there is only one door—the door of FAITH. "Jesus Christ is made unto us wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption." Surely any one can see that the very acknowledgement that we are suffering a "discipline" implies that some lesson is unlearned. But how shall we learn it? By stubbornly bearing the punishment? or by applying our whole energies to the task of

closely following the delicate leadings of the spirit? If sickness must come, it is because the "flesh" will not die. We fail to "reckon ourselves dead indeed unto sin," and again fail to reckon ourselves "alive unto God through Jesus Christ." Truly the only real way to glorify God in sickness, is to give Him a chance to manifest his power in destroying it, as one of the works of the devil.

But many a soul has been converted in sickness. True. So some men have been converted in jail, or upon the gallows. Francis Murphy, the great temperance lecturer was saved in a prison cell; but no one would argue that he should have remained there any longer than necessary. The Lord's truth is unsparing, and I must speak as before my God. It may seem a hard thing to say, but it is plain that the saintly reputation of so many lingering invalids, can not be built upon their years of suffering, for these are rather the evidence either of some great sin in the past, or of a persistent lack of conformity to the will of God in one way or another. Mark, I do not assert that every sick man is to be set down as a great sinner; but merely to say that his sickness is by no means a correct evidence of his sanctity. The weight of inference, were it our business to judge, would bear strongly the other way. I press this point because the Lord gives me to see the greatest danger in false humility. He who is thanking God for the equanimity with which he bears his sufferings, had better ask for grace to open his eyes wide enough to see the finger of Jesus beckoning

him on to a more complete self-surrender and simple faith.

"For God speaketh once, yea twice, yet man perceiveth it not. In a dream, in a vision of the night, when deep sleep falleth upon men, in slumberings upon the bed; then he openeth the ears of men, and sealeth their instruction, that he may withdraw man from his purpose, and hide pride from man. He keepeth back his soul from the pit, and his life from perishing by the sword. He is chastened also with pain upon his bed, and the multitude of his bones with strong pain; so that his life abhorreth bread, and his soul dainty meat. His flesh is consumed away, that it cannot be seen; and his bones that were not seen stick out. Yea, his soul draweth near unto the grave, and his life to the destroyers. *If there be a messenger with him, an interpreter*, one among a thousand, to show unto man his uprightness; then he is gracious unto him, and saith, *Deliver him from going down to the pit; I have found a ransom.* His flesh shall be fresher than a child's; he shall return to the days of his youth. He shall pray unto God, and he will be favorable unto him; and he shall see his face with joy; for he will render unto man his righteousness. He looketh upon men, and *if any say, I have sinned*, and perverted that which was right, and it profited me not; *He will deliver* his soul from going into the pit, and his life shall see the light. *Lo, all these things worketh God oftentimes with man, to bring back his soul* from the pit, to be enlightened with the light of the living."—Job xxxiii.

Now any one who will read these verses from the Word, cannot fail to be struck with their plain teaching. Here we are distinctly told by Elihu, the "daysman," these things come upon man as a discipline, to "withdraw man from his purpose, and hide pride from man." Then, after minutely describing physical suffering he positively affirms that if a "messenger" or an "interpreter" sets the truth before him and he accepts it, "*then*" God is gracious to him, and *delivers* him, having "found a ransom." And with minute detail the restoration of perfect physical health is set forth: "His flesh shall be fresher than a child's: he shall return to the days of his youth." Then, not slighting the way and means of this wonderful restoration, Elihu specifies how it can be secured. Strangely enough he agrees exactly with the Apostle James. Prayer was the Scriptural "means" in the days of Job, as well as in the Christian era. "He shall pray unto God, and he *will* be favorable unto him, etc." It may be well to parallel the two directions; it will do us good to see how God is "the same, yesterday, to-day and forever."

SCRIPTURAL MEANS OF HEALING.

According to Elihu.	*According to St. James.*
B. C.	A. D.
Call for a "messenger * * an interpreter."	"Call for the elders of the church."
"He shall pray."	"Let them pray for him."
"Unto God."	"Anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord."
"And he shall be favorable unto him."	"And the prayer of faith shall heal the sick."

According to Elihu. B. C.	*According to St. James.* A. D.
"He (God) will deliver his soul from going down into the pit, and his life shall see the light."	"And the Lord shall raise him up."
"If any say, I have sinned, and perverted right, He will deliver his soul," etc.	"If he have committed sins they shall be forgiven him."

Truly His word endureth forever. The way of ceremonies may change, but the way of faith, never. Let us especially notice that Elihu emphasizes the fact that all these sicknesses come solely, "To bring back his own soul from the pit." O, yes, you say; we will agree to that: sickness is necessary sometimes to keep a man from being lost. Ah! brother, read on. The old preacher was just guided by the Spirit to provide for that point. He adds, with a clearness that admits of no denial, that the discipline is not only to save from hell, but also that the patient may "be enlightened with the *light of the living.*" Hezekiah says "The grave cannot praise thee, the living, the living, he shall praise thee, as I do this day." Isa. xxxviii. 18–19. O, brother, do you not see your privilege in Christ Jesus?

It is true that every sick man and woman can not, or more properly will not, be healed. There are those who have believed the evil report of the spies, and who can not enter into the promised land, but must per force wander and die in the desert. This is true, spiritually and physically. But no one who hears of the Gospel to the sick for the the first time can claim to be of that number, unless indeed

his resistance to spiritual leading has been so obstinate and persistent that body and soul are alike debarred from Canaan. At the same time I apprehend that not many if any, will advance into perfect trust for the body, who do not perfectly trust for the soul. Why should they? When Jesus was on earth, visible to sense, SENSE took the stronger hold. Result; thousands were physically healed, and comparatively few thoroughly regenerated. But as soon as Christ became visible only to the spiritual eye of faith, these things were reversed. Thousands of souls believed; but few were and are healed. The reason is plain. Man realizes that sense cannot save his soul, but it is desperately hard to give up a sensible physical body entirely to the control of faith. Therefore the supposed danger is not likely to exist. If a man can trust for bodily healing, in *real faith*, it almost necessitates a co-existent soul-faith. Experience abundantly proves this to be true; for no one has been known to trust for the body, who has not received a great spiritual blessing, even when the healing has been withheld.

But it will be objected that if God will remove a disciplinary sickness, as soon as the lesson is learned, why will He not also remove a disciplinary temptation in the same way? But the Bible says, "count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations."

This is easily answered. We must remember that a temptation is not a sin. It is sent from the outside (in the case of a heart wholly sanctified),

and we are distinctly told that, no matter what it may be, God "will provide a way that ye may be able to bear it." We are to put on the "whole armour," and with the shield of faith "quench all the fiery darts of the devil." Nothing is said about the darts piercing the armour, rankling in the flesh, poisoning the blood, and requiring to be pulled out. No, praise the dear Lord! they are all to be stopped, *on the outside*. They may keep us very busy, active in prayer, in the use of the "sword of the Spirit," and the "shield of faith," but they are to be quenched before they wound us. We "count it all joy when we fall *into* divers temptations," but by no means when we fall *under* divers temptations. How plain this makes it! Sickness is not a *dart*, but a *wound*. Satan can use it as a "dart," or a temptation, by threatening us with disease. He often shakes his dart at me, and tells me—now you are going to have a cold; don't you feel it coming? You are all worn out by over-work, and are getting low fever; you know it is creeping on you now, etc. And when he says these things, he often manages to insinuate a slight symptom of the disorder mentioned. This is the "dart." It becomes a positive *temptation to be sick*. But by God's grace I raise the "shield of faith," and cry out, "Himself took my infirmities and bore my sicknesses," and the "dart" is "quenched." At the same time I earnestly entreat the Lord to show me whether I have neglected any leading of the Spirit, and to open my eyes to behold wondrous things out of His law. And I do

not "think it strange," for I know that "the trying of my faith worketh patience." If I am trusting Jesus to keep me from anything, I may naturally expect Satan to specially tempt me on that very line.

But I do not have to be sick, in order to be tried any more than I am compelled to sin. The temptations must come, but praise the Lord! they need not enter in. The three Hebrew children walked in the very midst of the burning fiery furnace, surrounded by fire, walled in by fire, walking on fire, seeing fire all around them; but the Son of God was there, and when they came out not even "the smell of fire had *passed on them.*" It had passed all around them; it had wreathed itself into terrible shapes, it had hissed and roared; but it could not pass on them, for they walked with the Son of God. We can glorify God by quenching the darts, but not so well by getting wounded and disabled, all along the line. Surely the Christian's warfare is a fight in the field, not an existence in the ambulance and the hospital. The only true way to glorify God in the midst of sin, sickness, or any temptation whatever, is to have the power of an almighty Saviour prevent them all from penetrating the whole armour of God in which we are clothed.

We sometimes hear people talk about "kissing the rod" which chastises them. This is part and parcel of the miserable delusion of Satan that God himself actually and directly wields that rod. It is very easy to substantially set forth from Scrip-

ture that sin itself may be called a rod of correction in many cases; in that the consequence is inseparably connected with the act. But who will talk of kissing sin? Or the rod may be sickness, which is admitted on all sides to be, in general, the result of sin. Shall we kiss sickness? Is it a good thing? Does not God distinctly set it forth as a curse? I do not intentionally avoid the higher meaning, however. It will be claimed that the law is holy and just and good, and that "kissing the rod" properly means a humble acquiescence in God's law. Well this is all right of course, but unfortunately it is one of those short truths that do not span the particular chasm before us. When people talk this way they forget that God's law has two grand divisions,

1. THE LAW OF DEATH.
2. THE LAW OF LIFE.

Anything, anything to beat Jesus Christ,—is the devil's everlasting maxim. He will allow us, and even persuade us to accept the law of death, if thereby we are blinded to the law of life. "Kissing the rod" simply means acknowledging God's justice in the whippings we receive. It should mean that we kiss not only the rod of justice, but also the rod of power. The rod of Moses carried death and destruction to Egypt, but life and deliverance to Israel. O reader, just resolve to kiss the rod on the other side, the side of a whole and perfect salvation from all the works of the devil in your soul and body! As a matter of fact I do not read of "kissing the rod" in the Word, but I do read

"kiss the Son lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him." Ah! give Jesus the kiss of trust, not merely the token of a reluctant submission.

This gives us the right view as to

16.—God's Will to Heal.

A lady at Old Orchard once talked with me on this subject. She assured me quite volubly of her absolute consecration to God, and her willingness to do anything for Him; but she could not help thinking it was God's will that she should continue to suffer. I asked her if she was willing to believe God. Of course she was! Well then could she believe, "Is *any* sick, let them call," etc. Here she hesitated. Now there is just one thing which ought to cause this false excuse for the absence of faith to stick in the throat. It is this: *Nearly every one of these people who say they believe or suppose it is God's will for them to be sick, have been and are diligently seeking remedies all over the face of the earth, and spending all their substance on physicians, in the direct effort to get well.* They are thus, by their own confession, placed in the position of *obstinate rebellion* against the will of God. They say it is God's will they should be ill, and at that very time are doing all in their power to defeat that will. Let all such invalids be consistent. Give up all medicines at once, and lie down in submission to the supposed will of God. When a pain comes, cry out, it is the will of God, praise the Lord for it! When you feel sick and faint,

exclaim, praise the Lord for this also. Just try it for a while. Be consistent if you dare.

But that is the difficulty. These are the very people who will not dare; the very persons who will hang on to the medicine bottle with the clutch of a drowning man. If it were not such a terribly serious matter it would seem supremely ridiculous to stand by a sick man, hear him express his resignation to the will of God in measured terms, and then assist him to take his regular dose of some celebrated human remedy. The Lord grant that we may all be driven from this absurdly false position!

As a last resort, however, some one says: How can I know but that it is God's will for me to suffer at least for a time? And how shall I feel sure that He does not want me to use these gracious means and medicines which have saved so many lives? The answers to these are conclusive, and brief. 1. To know His will, read His word. If you do not hear Moses and the prophets, a risen dead man will not persuade you. Now God gives just one specific direction in His word to the sick, and that is a direction to get well. As to time, the only salvation in Scripture is a *now* salvation. 2. To know God's will as to means and medicines, read His word. His means and medicines are threefold,—prayer of faith, laying on of hands, anointing with oil in the name of the Lord. If you can get rid of your pride, your self-conceit, your *unbelieving heart*, and offer the sacrifice of simple, child-like *obedience*, you can be healed and saved to

the uttermost *now*. God is always ready to do His work, but it must be done in His own way. We must be very, very humble to do God's work in His way. Peter and Paul were more thoroughly and deeply abused than the rest of the apostles, and we find that they alone were trusted to raise the dead. "The deepest depths lead to the loftiest heights."

I am now going to venture on a startling statement. No man can *fully* and *completely* offer the Lord's prayer, who does not really desire, above all things, that God's will shall be done in his body, soul and spirit. "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit." In order to pray "Thy will be done in earth *as* it is in heaven," I must have nothing whatever between me and God. I must be cordially willing to be deemed a fool for Christ's sake; to be called a fanatic, and to be looked upon with suspicion, even by my best friends. I must be ready to stand on God's word against my family, and relations, and even against persecution from high official sources. I must earnestly long for God's perfect work to be done in my entire being, and especially, that it be done *in God's way*. I must implicitly accept the rule of faith as the guide of my daily life in all things, small or great. And I must *believe* of course that God *is ready now* to perform His will in me, even to the uttermost. In the light of the truth, we see that God's will for us in this life is perfect freedom from the dominion or pollution of sin, and its attendants (sickness included); and, "IF we walk in the light

as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin." Praise the Lord!

There is not a law, given under Moses, that is plainer and more positive than the law of physical health, in Ex. [illegible] And there in not a command, given under the gospel, more explicit and more clear in its attendant promise than the direction to the sick, in James v. 14, 15. We believe that Jesus actually "bore our sins in his own body on the tree," and consequently we do not have to remain in sin. And we read that "Himself took our infirmities and bore our sicknesses." How then can we possibly fail to see that "by His stripes we are healed," in body as well as in soul? Glory to God! for a perfect and a present salvation!

17.—That Review Article.

In the *Presbyterian Review* for July, 1883 appeared an article on "Modern Miracles," by Rev. Marvin R. Vincent, D. D. His object was to show that the theories presented in Dr. A J. Gordon's book, "The Ministry of Healing," are erroneous. In the course of this article, which is exceedingly courteous throughout, he advances many objections. It may be well to notice those which he deems most important, and subject them to the proper test of scriptural logic. I will simply take them as they occur, without regard to consecutiveness of thought.

1. He quotes Trench as saying that miracles in Scripture are clustered around a few great epochs

17 Cf 15: 26

and persons, and argues that this proves that God has not intended them to be common.

Answer. So far as marked miracles over nature are concerned this may be granted (only for the sake of argument;) but with regard to the healing of sickness, a sufficient reply is found in Jesus' words, "And many lepers were in Israel in the time of Eliseus the prophet; and none of them was cleansed, saving Naaman the Syrian." Luke iv. 27. This was spoken in Nazareth, where "he did not many mighty works *because of their unbelief*." Matt. xiii. 58. Here Christ clearly gives the reason why more miracles were not performed—UNBELIEF. Again, the very epochs he cites—Moses, Elijah, Babylonish captivity, present the truth he widely misses, that *when men are thrown desperately upon God, and God alone*, the kind of faith springs up which allows "mighty works" to be done. "All things are possible only to him that believeth." Dr. Vincent says himself, on p. 476, "Supernatural interventions are not lavished in unnecessary and wasteful profusion. *They come only at the call of need*." Certainly; and as we have just seen, desperate need begets desperate faith, and then miracles are not in danger of being "wasted," as they would be if cast before unbelievers.

2. He alludes to Dr. Gordon's citation of healings and miracles among all struggling and persecuted churches; as the Moravians, Huguenots, Covenanters, Friends, Baptists, Methodists, Waldenses, etc. He then attempts to answer this by saying, "the

great revivals which have taken place in this country do not confirm Mr. Gordon's sweeping statement that miracles 'everywhere' attend 'a revival of faith.'"

Answer. This is very wide of the mark. Miracles do not specially attend a "revival of faith" which has no possible faith in modern miracles. How absurd to imagine that any class of men, who discredit the supernatural entirely, will ever be healed miraculously, no matter how much their spiritual faith be revived. If Dr. Vincent will take the pains to follow the already wonderful history of the "revival of faith" for physical healing, that has been rising all over Christendom for the last forty years, he will find that miracles of healing are multiplying with the most astonishing rapidity.

3. "Granting they spring up round the cradle of of new-born faith, they follow the great general law of retrocession which marks the display of miraculous energy along the line of Christian development."

Answer. If they do, what is proven? It will be very hard to show that God arbitrarily withholds the power when we read so many promises in Scripture. Dr. Vincent says that the miracles have fallen off in much greater proportion than the spiritual manifestations. Well, suppose that men naturally lose faith in the active, *present* benefits of Christ's salvation, while clinging to the more vague, *future* deliverance from hell. Who will venture to say this is not so? The truth is the present fruits

of salvation require a vivid, present renunciation and faith. *Thousands trust God for eternity, who can not possibly make up their minds to trust Him for time.* How few alas! realize the present cleansing from all sin, which is their blood-bought privilege! Is it any wonder then that so many have failed to know Jehovah Rophi?

4. Dr. Bushnell is quoted as saying, "What is wanted is a full, consecutive inventory of the supernatural events or phenomena of the world."

Answer. No, what is wanted is unquestionable faith in God. There are too many calls for somebody to endorse God's notes of promise. But why did not Dr. Vincent quote from Bushnell, when the latter gives case after case of modern miracles? See "Nature and Supernatural," by Horace Bushnell, last chapter.

5. "It is very easy to point out multitudes of cases where every evidence testifies to a high degree of living faith, but where these signs do *not* follow, and never have followed them which believe; and these cases are in the vast majority over those in which miraculous energy is developed or claimed."

Answer. This is the most unfortunate argument possible. It is a clear case of argumentative suicide. The truth is this "vast majority" never had any faith whatever in the "signs;" never dreamed of asking God for them, as the apostles did (Acts iv. 29, 30); never thought of taking Paul's direction literally "covet earnestly the best gifts," (1 Cor. xii. 31); and, in short would,

with one voice, unite with Dr. Vincent in saying, "The days of miracles have passed." Think of the most spiritual man you please; one who walks near to God. Then try to imagine the sick being healed in answer to his prayers, when he frankly expresses his entire disbelief in the present application of Mark xvi. 17, James v. 14, 15, and 1 Cor. xii. How are the signs to follow those who do not and never did believe *in the signs?* The apostles did believe in them, and they specially asked God to send them *through them.* When the "vast majority" do this and then fail, Dr. Vincent's argument will be in order.

6. Dr. Gordon having stated that raising the dead was not included in the "signs," Dr. Vincent argues that we cannot account for the resurrection of Dorcas.

Answer. Jesus, himself, healed every day, but he only raised the dead three times. This of itself indicates an exceptional quality in this miracle. The apostles only performed it twice, so far as we know. This confirms the thought. The true reply is that the Spirit evidently directed Peter and Paul upon these special occasions. Peter only spoke *after* he had "kneeled down and prayed." Dr. Gordon quotes from "Scot's Worthies" the testimony as to the raising from the dead of a young man, in answer to forty-eight hours continuous prayer, by the covenanter, John Welch. Dr. Vincent does not notice that; I presume he does not believe it. Dr. Gordon aptly says, "If we are startled to ask in amazement—'are such things

possible in modern times?' we might better begin with the question, has such praying and resistless importunity with God ever been heard of in modern times? *If we can get a miraculous faith*, the miraculous work will be easy enough to credit."

7. Dr. Vincent quotes John xiv. 12, and adds: "If that promise is literally applicable to the healing of sick in the church of all ages, it is equally applicable to the other works performed by Christ, and true believers in the modern church ought to do greater works than any of these and more of them."

Answer. Will Dr. Vincent produce the "true believers" who have actual faith that the Lord calls them to do these "greater works"? Certainly "true believers" *ought* to do many things; but where are the "true believers" to be found? But, is it not perfectly clear that all such signs and wonders must, of necessity, be under God's control and not man's? Dr. Vincent makes the common mistake of supposing that these miraculous powers are to be under the immediate direction of the believer. Did Paul work as he pleased? Did Moses perform a single miracle undirected by God? Surely Christians ought not to be so blind on this point. Let the skeptic be assured, that a real "true believer" will do any mighty work whatever for God's glory, *when God directs him to do it.* Two things are absolutely essential, both of which are totally ignored by objectors. First, a Christian who really has faith for and in the miracle. Sec-

ond, the direction of the Spirit to perform it. In the case of praying with the sick, we have the plain command, "Is *any* sick," etc. But for the rest we have no word which says *all* these signs shall follow *every* believer; but rather the contrary, for Paul speaks of the "Spirit dividing to every man severally *as he will*."—1 Cor. xii. 11. As to the special signs of tongues, drinking deadly things, resisting the bite of serpents, etc., see "Supernatural Gifts of the Spirit."

8. "It surely requires no argument to show that the Lord's Supper, prefigured in the formal institution of the Passover, and solemnly *enjoined* on the Church as a perpetual observance, stands on a different basis from the healing of the sick. The following statement of Mr. Gordon is simply monstrous: 'In St. James' Epistle we find healing recognized as an ordinance *just as* in Paul's Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians we find Baptism and the Lord's Supper recognized as ordinances. As signs they could never lose their significance till the Lord comes again.'"

Answer. The Lord's Supper was "prefigured in the formal institution of the Passover." Granted. But who knew that under Moses? It was only "prefigured." Whereas, healing by the power of God was much more "prefigured." It was set forth in whole chapters of the law; it was formally "enjoined upon the church" (Israel), in company with the rest of the law, as continually binding. It was enunciated in the most positive of plain language in Ex. xv. 26. It was repeated again and

again, see Ex. xxiii. 25; Lev. xxvi. 15, 16, 40; Deut. v. 33; and vii. 15, and xxxii. 39; 1 Sam. ii. 6. When Christ came He said that he "came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill." This special law of healing, by God's power alone, was almost the first one He set forth. He made it His daily business. Even where people had so much "unbelief" that He could not do "many mighty works," He healed a few sick people. He handed over this healing commission to the twelve, then to the seventy, and finally to "them that believe." Miracles of healing were the first He wrought, according to Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and the commission to heal constitutes the last codicil of His New Testament, accompanying the declaration "all power is given unto me in heaven and earth," and, "Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the age." The Acts of the Apostles refer to this twenty times to one reference to the Lord's Supper, and the proportion is in its favor in the Epistles. James "solemnly enjoins" this ordinance upon the "twelve tribes scattered abroad"; and even the Revelator, as we have seen, omits to mention sickness in this list of the tribulations left behind on earth. Healing by faith was not only "prefigured," but was *practised* all along the ages before Christ, and since that time has been continuously known in the church to "them that believe." It is true Christ stopped the ceremonial law but He only strengthened and enlarged the moral and spiritual law.

9. Dr. Vincent attempts to weaken the force of the argument by citing cases of recovery through

the effect of imagination, etc. Again he does good service in substantiating some of the Romish miracles. He says of these, "The fact remains, cures are wrought (at Lourdes and elsewhere) and the testimony to the cures is abundant, and as respectable as that which attests the work of Dorothea Trudel or of Dr. Cullis."

Answer. Nobody discredits the force of the imagination. Many people have been cured in that way who did not trust in God. With them we have nothing whatever to do at present. We are speaking about those who do trust. Suppose it be shown that a man, whose imagination could not possibly be spurred into sufficient activity by love of life, family ties and affections, physical sufferings or physicians' remedies, suddenly takes hold of God by faith and rapidly recovers. And suppose it be admitted that his imagination was the agent used in his restoration to health. What then? Who should have the glory? I do not know what particular medicine God uses in each case, but if I happen to discover its name, shall I transform the medicine into the physician? But this whole line of argument begs the question. There are plenty of cases where imagination could by no possibility have operated in the least. Read of the scalded child in "Pastor Blumhardt," of the many cures of cancer, of broken limbs healed in a night, of blind eyes thoroughly restored, of cut and shrunken tendons renewed, and of the many, many testimonies so rapidly multiplying on all sides.*

*See numerous publications in Willard Tract Repository Catalogue.

10. He asserts that Christ "never despised natural agencies, but used them freely."

Answer. For proof of this remarkable statement he offers, the water changed to wine at Cana, and the net used in the miraculous draught of fishes. Strange blindness that cannot see the test of faith given to those about our Lord. The use of the water in itself proved His power over nature, while it gave occasion for faith in those who stood by. The net was not necessary to get the fishes into the boat; God's power could have caused them to leap in; but it was necessary to try the disciple's faith. They had "toiled all night and taken nothing," and now Jesus told them to cast just where they had been dragging. They might well have said, Lord there are no fish here, we have tried already; but somehow their faith stood the test, they obeyed orders without any theorizing, and of course received their reward.

11. He thinks that miracles would be "cheapened" if given as "ordinary remedies for sick headache or colic."

Answer. Never despise the day of small things. Praise the dear Lord! there are no little things with God. Did our good brother ever think God's providential care is "cheapened" by counting the hairs of his head, or by taking care of a little sparrow when it falls the the ground? How gloriously "cheap" this healing power was when Jesus "healed all that had need of healing," and when "as many as touched were made perfectly whole!" The Saviour, who can note that a man is "carrying

a pitcher of water," can surely listen when His children suffer with a sick headache. "Except ye become as little children." How the church needs that truth to-day. What true mother ever thought her love "cheapened" by listening to the childish troubles of her boy? Bless the Lord, salvation is so cheap that it is absolutely *free!*

12. "If indeed, society, after the lapse of these Christian centuries, can be redeemed only by a second manifestation of God in the flesh, then it may be frankly conceded that it needs physical miracles to attest and effectuate the work of redemption. Then the work of the Holy Spirit is branded with failure, and He is proved impotent to fulfill His promise to convict the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment."—John xvi. 8–11.

Answer. When will Christians, as a body, give up the idea that the church is destined to convert the world? "Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse," "In the last days perilous times shall come," "As it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, *until the day* that Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day that the Son of man is revealed." The leaven (always a symbol of death and destruction) works "till the whole is leavened." The tares and wheat "both grow together till the harvest." These and a multitude of other Scriptures are totally ignored.

The quotation from John xvi. 8–11, is most singularly unfortunate. It contains a plain declaration that the Holy Spirit shall "convict" (that is the real meaning of the Greek) *the world* of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment. We may well quote Christ's question, "When the Son of man cometh shall He find faith on earth?" A world "convicted" of sin, righteousness and judgment, certainly has the greatest possible need of miracles of salvation. The Holy Spirit is working hard to-day to "convict" the world, but the world listens to the siren song, "we are growing better every day," and refuses to acknowledge the conviction. Christians shut their eyes to their lack of real, earnest, simple faith; and eloquently discourse about all these "Christian centuries," and of the "development of Christianity." It would not be very hard, in looking over the "Christian centuries," to show that the tares have lived up to their reputation, and grown faster than the wheat. The most remarkable development in real Christian experience seems to be the development of unbelief, and of innumerable schemes for limiting God, and discrediting the plain sense of His word.

Our brother seems to forget the many prophecies which distinctly affirm that the "second manifestation" will be preceded and attended by miracles, much more astounding than any that even Moses ever saw. In view of these tremendous facts, may we not as well ask whether the marked revival of miracles of healing in modern times is not one of those signs which surely indicate the

speedy coming of the Lord? Let us lift up our heads, for our redemption draweth nigh; that redemption of soul and body together for which Paul longed, and for which "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain until now, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." Let us not despise our physical part, but only look for its perfection, echoing the wish of the apostle, "not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon."—2 Cor. v. 4.

"The judge standeth at the door. We are even now touching on the last scene of this awful mystery, and therefore we ought to be looking for the immediate appearance of the gifts." *

18.—Why Not Instantaneous?

Before I was healed myself, I had an honest impression that if God chose to heal any man in these times, He would do a perfect work, and make the thing complete at once. I argued that Jesus Christ healed in this way when upon earth, and that there should be no difference now. I see very differently to-day, not because my own cure was gradual, but because the Lord has opened my eyes. As a matter of fact, there are a few cases of healing recorded in the Bible which might be called gradual. †

* Thomas Erskine, in Supernatural Gifts of The Spirit.

† The Lord took a quarter of a century to heal Sarah of barrenness. Sarah was one of the doubting kind. She laughed at God's power. But after twenty-five years it was by faith that she received strength to bear a son. Heb. xi.11. This surely was gradual enough.

1. Miriam. She was smitten with leprosy. Moses prayed, "Heal her now, O God, I beseech thee." But the Lord said, "If her father had but spit in her face, should she not be ashamed seven days? Let her be shut out from camp seven days, and after that let her be received in again." Here we see that God declined to answer the direct letter of the prayer, "to heal her *now*," because, by His law, she required seven days of purification. This is exceedingly significant. Many a Christian comes for bodily healing to-day with a very imperfect idea of the depth and breadth of spiritual renunciation and consecration required by the *law of perfect love*. Hence the healing is gradual, that the soul may learn, and learning may be purified through faith by the blood.

2. In the raising of the Shunamite's son, there were stages which make it a gradual case. See 2 Kings iv.

3. King Hezekiah was healed, during three days.—2 Kings xx. 5.

4. Job's boils did not vanish instantly; at least there is not the slightest indication in the record of such an event.

5. When David said, "I shall not die, but live, and declare the works of the Lord," (Psalm cxviii. 17) it would seem that he expected to recover from illness, or felt that he was recovering.

When we come to the miracles of Jesus, it might be argued with perfect fairness that it is entirely possible that many were gradually healed. Such statements as "Jesus went about all Galilee

. . . healing all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people,"—Matt. iv. 23; and "Jesus went about all the cities and villages . . . healing every sickness and every disease among the people,"—Matt. ix. 35, cannot be used to prove that all these cures were instantaneous. On the contrary, reasoning from experience, we would be inclined to say that the comparatively few cases of healing, specially recorded in the text, were the most remarkable ones. Why were they selected out of such multitudes of instances? Humanly reasoning there could be only one cause—the desire to specialize the most extraordinary. No one, who believes only in the general inspiration of the Scriptures, can object to this line of argument. I give it for the benefit of such objectors. I can not say I believe it myself. There is, to me, a better reason. Still it has strength, for we read that when the whole multitude sought to touch the hem of His garment, "as many as touched were made perfectly whole."—Matt. xiv. 36. Why did not the apostle add some such note in either of the cases previously cited? But I do not care for this; it is contrary to my own belief in the original verbal inspiration of God's Word.

6. In Mark viii. 22–25, we have the case of the blind man whose eyes Jesus touched twice before he was fully healed.

7. John iv. 49–52 gives us a marked case. The nobleman asked for life. Jesus said, "Thy son liveth." He did not say he was entirely well; and so the father learned from the servants that

he "began to amend" at the very time of Jesus' words. This case illustrates the fact that God often gives no more than we ask. Modern experience furnishes many instances where God has granted wonderful improvement; whereupon the patient has confessed to a lack of faith, or even inclination to ask for complete healing.

8. Jno. ix. 1–7. Here we have a strong case. Jesus laid His divine touch upon the blind eyes, but they did not open. "Go wash in the pool of Siloam." When this was done, the man "came seeing." There is a world of education here for the inquiring soul. When we can give the simple testimony of *absolute unquestioning obedience*, "I went, I washed," it will not be long before we will joyfully add, "I see." We can see plainly that though the touch of God had been given, the healing was delayed until the man had carried out to the letter the commands of Jesus. Many would be healed to-day if they would only give up all, or do all, or take all that they feel to be required in the Word. But the pool of Siloam appears unnecessary, or repugnant to the reason or the heart, and they will not obey fully. The Spirit whispers "go, wash;" but they rebel. *My brother you must be clean in order to see.* "Light is sown for the righteous." He who carries a pack upon his back must bend over, and sees only the ground. Get rid of your burden of doubts, fears, hesitatings, pride; and you will walk erect in the light of heaven.

9. Lazarus. It seems to have escaped everyone's mind that this friend of the Lord's was prayed for

while sick, but notwithstanding, he grew worse and finally died. "His sisters sent unto him, saying, Lord, behold he whom thou lovest is sick." Jno. xi. 3. Oh! what a prayer that was! It thrills me through and through as I read it. What simple faith, what absolute confidence, what perfect trust in the love of Christ! "Lord, behold he whom thou lovest is sick." Glory to God! Why can not we believe that way? Has not God filled His Word with declarations of His love for me? Do I not read "God so loved the world that He gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life?" Did not Jesus give His life a ransom for me? Did He not *first* love me? Has He not promised to "withhold no good thing from them that walk uprightly?" And am I not trusting the blood to cleanse me now from all sin? Does not the Spirit witness with my spirit that I am a child of God? Is He not Jehovah Rophi still? Did not Jesus bear my sicknesses and my sins for me? O, when these things are so, how can I fail, if sickness comes, to just go to Jesus and confidently cry "Lord, he whom thou lovest is sick?" God always honors child-like faith such as this.

True they said "Lord, if thou hadst been here my brother had not died." Legalist Martha spoke it partly in remonstrance, but Mary in the same loving confidence in the loving Jesus. The lesson of the whole event is plainly set forth, "This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God,

that the Son of God might be glorified thereby." "And I am glad *for your sakes* that I was not there, to the intent ye may believe." "Said I not unto thee, that, *if thou wouldest believe*, thou shouldest see the glory of God?" "I knew that thou hearest me always: but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me." These verses show that the Lord may withhold the visible answer until the time best adapted to glorify His Son. And they show that a sick one may recover, after some time, and after many prayers, in order that those "which stand by may believe." It does not argue anything against being kept from sickness at all. That experience belongs to another plane altogether. We are now considering those who first seek healing through faith. My heart disease was cured gradually, but since that event I have been enabled to praise God for the instantaneous cure of other complaints. Upon one occasion I suffered for two days with cold, fever and chill. I prayed constantly, and rested in Jesus alone. At last faith seemed to be given for actual grasping of the promise; the Word was given me, and *suddenly* the chill and all sickness left me. I threw off the thick quilt in which I had been wrapped, and praised the Lord for complete deliverance. Glory to His name!

10. The case of Epaphroditus, Phil. ii. 26, 27, seems to speak of an illness of some duration; yet it was God who "had mercy upon him," and raised him up, in answer to Paul's prayers in his behalf.

11. Trophimus was certainly a gradual case, as Paul was compelled to leave him behind at Miletum. 2 Tim. iv. 20.

These are surely enough to demonstrate that healing in Bible times was not always instantaneous. When Jesus Himself healed, He was guided by an infallible judgment and perception. "He knew what was in man." The Apostles may be granted an inspired insight, in many cases at any rate. "Seeing he had faith to be healed," testifies to this inspiration in one instance at least. Acts xiv. 9. But we know that Paul sometimes lacked the "mind of the Lord." It is therefore entirely possible that he occasionally failed to heal immediately, as he certainly did fail in the case of Trophimus.

We have already seen that there are many reasons for gradual healing to-day. All allow that sickness is a discipline. But manifestly the disease can not be removed if the patient refuses to yield to the divine purpose. If we are slow in learning the lesson set us, why should we wonder at the slow removal of the teacher? Truly "God speaketh once, yea twice, yet man perceiveth it not." Let any one who doubts the need of gradual healing, carefully read and ponder upon the thirty-third chapter of Job. No words of man can make it plainer. "The entrance of Thy words giveth light."

Finally, some people say that they know such a Christian, one of the salt of the earth, who has prayed and prayed and prayed, yet has not recov-

ered. I reply. No one can tell when any man has "touched" Jesus, except Christ and the individual soul. No man can see and prove the union, the absolute consecration, the simple faith. The Jews doubted the union between Jesus and God, and thus brought upon themselves the reproof "Ye receive not our witness." Like Jesus we can "speak the things that *we* do know;" but they can not be proved any other way. If we "touch the hem of his garment," we will know it. Therefore we find three vital reasons for an imperfect or a gradual healing.

1. The absence of the complete "touch."

2. Imperfect consecration, requiring time for the entrance of the light and the deepening of the work.

3. Not comprehending, nor apprehending God's plan. "The law is a schoolmaster to bring us to Christ," and the Word distinctly teaches, as we have seen, that sickness comes from violation of the law. But when we come to Jesus, when the conditions are all met, when we touch, we are certainly healed. Praise the Lord!

CHAPTER VI.

Full Salvation.

"And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly, and I pray God that your whole spirit, and soul, and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."—1 Thess. v. 23.

"Beloved I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth."—3 John 2.

"We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not."—1 John v. 18.

SALVATION is a big word. To my apprehension, and in my experience it has marvellously expanded during these last five years of communion with God. It is a perfect word, and represents a perfect work. As we have seen, Salvation has four sides. Now the number 4 has always had the special significance of perfection, in connection with mankind. The old giant, who owned Hebron, was called Arba; and Rev. Alfred Jones, in his dictionary of Scripture names, tells us that the word means "quadrangular," and that he was so called on account of the perfection and strength of his form. He also says that the Romans used a quadrangular stone as a symbol of wisdom and strength of mind. Dr. Milo Mahan, in his "Mystic Numbers," gives it special prominence in connection with mankind and the earth.

The *four* quarters of the world, the *four* feet of the highest order of beasts, the *four* elements, *four* rivers of Paradise, the *four* gospels, *four* camps of Israel, the *four square* city of the redeemed. It is the figure of the *Cosmos* in its universality and order; the idea being that of a concentrated and orderly, not of a vague universality. Prof. Asahel Abbott says, that four always relates to man as a spirit immersed in matter. In Theosophy, it is God in a sensible form, revealing Himself to the senses of His creatures. Hence the Pythagoreans swore their great oath by Four (the Tetractys), "that hath revealed to our souls the fountain of ever-flowing nature." Man has a dual nature, and each half is itself a duality. We may divide thus:

	Nature.	*Defects.*	
Soul.	Spiritual,	Inbred Sin, or Depravity.	Salvation.
	Moral,	Committed Sin, or Transgression.	
Body.	Physical,	Sickness, or Disease.	
	Mental,	Sorrow, or Affliction.	

Here we see the comprehensive sweep of the Atonement. Jesus Christ died to save men wholly. Strange to say, all Christians allow that two out of the four great deficiencies in our nature—the moral and the mental—are embraced in the *present* scope of the Great Sacrifice. A large number of Christians are willing to accept a third—the Inbred Sin, or depravity; but the church has almost lost sight of the possibility of deliverance from the fourth. Committed sin can be very properly placed under the head of the moral law or nature; and sorrow

or affliction is manifestly a mental trouble. These, all agree, can be handed over to Jesus *at the present moment.* But just here a vast majority of the church stops short, in experience, if not in theory. The wonderful power of the Atonement to cleanse from all the SIN which was inherited as an inborn taint of corruption, is totally unknown to multitudes who worship God in sincerity and truth. One half the Atonement is therefore overlooked, slighted, and absolutely discredited by the majority of the Church to-day. These halves are not mathematically divided, for which we have reason to be devoutly thankful, and in God's mercy, we have held to the more vital portion of our Savior's work. Yet the other half exists. Thanks to the power of the truth, thousands of witnesses have testified, and do testify, to the reality of the death to inbred sin; and one very large branch of the church emphatically proclaims this item of faith in its official utterances, while some others, at least *allow* it. But few, if any, bodies of Christians, since the days of the Waldenses, have included faith in Christ for bodily healing in their church creeds.

Many a Christian, to-day, thinks the four evangelists good enough and amply sufficient for his daily reading, and neglects the rest of God's word altogether. Well, he can be saved of course, but will his soul ever grow fat? How Paul prays for the Ephesians, that they "may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye

might be filled with *all the fulness of God.*"—Eph. iii. 18, 19. The Church is sadly in need of *quadrangular* Christians to-day.

Dr. Vincent seems to think it a "huge impertinence" for anyone to say that unbelief is at the root of the church's failure to grasp a complete salvation. Impertinent or not, it is true. I remember that unbelief seriously hampered the twelve men who absolutely left their earthly all and followed Jesus in the flesh. Even when striving to do the Master's work, they were prevented by lack of faith. "Lord, why could not we cast him out? Because of your unbelief." Pastor Otto Stockmayer says, in "Sickness and the Gospel," p. 39: "Why do we not take the position of redeemed and sanctified which the work of Jesus Christ gives to us? Why is the discipline of sickness necessary to make us listen to our God, and walk in His ways in all things and at all times? Why, even in sickness, are we so slow to gather the lessons it brings us? Why has not God yet been able to make of us intelligent and powerful fellow-workers?—It is because of our unbelief. . . . . It did not occur to the Jews in the synagogue of Nazareth that, if in the time of Elijah all the widows in Israel were not miraculously helped like the one of Sarepta, if in the time of Elisha all the lepers of Israel were not cleansed like Naaman, all the fault was attributable to their unbelief.*—Luke iv. 25–27. In the

*I remark that when Jesus told them the truth, on this point, they considered it a "huge impertinence," and attempted to take his life.

same way, the Christians of to-day seem to ignore the power of the Savior whom God has given them, and of the fulness of the salvation which that Savior has procured for them."

Why is it that even the best Christian people to-day fall so frequently below the Bible standards or examples? Why is it that so few ministers of the Gospel are able to make Paul's language their own? How many can say "Thanks be unto God that *always* causeth us to triumph in Christ?" Why is it so few can testify to a vivid personal knowledge of the distinct baptism of the Holy Ghost? Why is it that many of the most learned doctors of divinity, equipped with every weapon of reason, knowledge, wit and oratory, utterly fail to lead souls to the Saviour? Is our God dead? Is the power that attended the work of the apostles, of Whitefield, Wesley, Jonathan Edwards, Asbury, and others, an arbitrary gift to a few? Is a personal experience like that of Paul, Fenelon, Madame Guyon, or Mrs. Edwards, something absolutely beyond the average Christian? O reader, what is it that bars the way? What can it be, but UNBELIEF? Paul emphatically enjoined upon the church to "covet earnestly" the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, which he took special pains to enumerate. Modern teachers say, do not covet any such thing, you cannot have them; it is preposterous for any man in these times to talk of a supernatural gift. And then they think it "huge impertinence" if they are accused of unbelief. May the dear Lord lift the

veil that is wound about so many of His children, when they read the Word.

FULL SALVATION.—How my whole being thrills with love and praise as I think of the rounded completeness of the finished work of my Jesus! Christ met and conquered every foe known to the human race. Yes every one. Even death suffered defeat at His hands.

It is not a conjecture which leads Stockmayer to say that when the church has realized the victory over sickness, she will be in a condition to pass on to the victory over death. Enoch and Elijah are not remembered as they should be. I cannot believe for a moment that these two were arbitrarily chosen by Jehovah to exemplify His power. Of course this end was accomplished beyond a doubt, but there is something deeper than that. I see in these two saints a glorious proof of the infinite possibilities open to the child of God. Two men of mortal mould have, by God's grace, lived so near to Him, kept His commands so inviolably, been so zealous in His work, worshipped Him in such absolute devotion, and above all, manifested such transcendent faith, that "the wicked one touched them not." Even over death they were triumphant. The fire of the Spirit burned so intensely in their souls and bodies, that even the mighty prince of darkness could not approach them near enough to cast his fatal dart. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, they passed away from earth, to be with the Lord. So the day is coming when, instead of two, many

who "are alive and remain shall be caught up to meet the Lord in the air." Will it be solely because an arbitrary date, set in the mind of God, has come? or may we not believe that, when that date does arrive, the children of the King will be walking with uplifted hearts, *really believing* that their redemption draweth nigh? Five out of ten virgins were ready with lamps trimmed and burning when the bridegroom came. The Lord grant that the proportion may hold good when the glad cry is heard "Behold the Bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet Him."

Let us "comfort one another with these words." Surely the great awakening to the willingness of Jesus to save the body from the powers of evil, is another and mighty token that the day of our redemption is at hand. Salvation is becoming more and more a positive reality. Religion begins again to mean something more than a profound mental apprehension of doctrine, and a keen sense of legal distinctions. The grammar of experience is being revised, and we see the possibility of living in the present tense, the first person, the singular number and the possessive case. Abstract nouns and nouns of multitude give place to distinctive proper names; the personal pronouns are limited to I and me, and the verb is known in its full sense—*to be, to do, and to suffer (or experience,) anything, and everything in Jesus.* Let us not "be fools and slow of heart to believe *all* that the prophets have spoken," but let us, like the noble Bereans, "search the Scriptures daily whether these things are so."

Acts xvii. 11, 12. It is wonderfully significant that when they thus searched daily, we are told, "*Therefore* many of them believed." Very often those who cry, "search and look, for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet," are, like the Pharisees, totally ignorant of the true meaning of Scripture, as well as of the real evidence in the case.

A short time ago I read of a woman in China, who, after hearing of the wonderful Jesus and his work, asked if she could not be healed of lameness; only to be sorrowfully informed by the missionary that the "days of miracles have passed." In contrast to this, read the following, from "China's millions."

"One day when our native helper, Mr. Yao, was preaching in the chapel, an old beggar-woman, of over seventy years of age, came to the door and listened to what was said about the person and power of the Lord Jesus Christ. She returned to her home and told Mrs. Chang, a blind neighbor, that which she had heard, and proposed, next day, to lead her around to the chapel and ask the teacher if Jesus could open her eyes. The old woman, accordingly, appeared at the chapel next day, with her blind frind, Mrs. Chang, and told the preacher their object in coming. After a long conversation, Mr. Yao told the blind woman that if she had faith to be healed it could be done. They accordingly, kneeled down and prayed that God would have mercy upon them and regard their prayer. This was repeated next day, and again on Sunday, when Mrs. Chang's eyes were

improving. She was beginning to see again. By the Sunday following, her sight—of which she had been deprived three years—was perfectly restored, and she now wished all to join her in praising God for what he had done. Within a fortnight after the day she was first led to the chapel and asked to be cured, her eyes were opened and she could see as other people. No medicines were used, nor were any other means than those of prayer and faith, employed to bring about this end. The simple woman believed implicity that Christ had the same power to heal to-day as He had eighteen hundred years ago; and she sought and found in Him what she desired."

Now which of the missionaries held up a perfect Saviour? "According to your faith be it unto you." David said, "I have set the Lord always before me (can we say that?) because he is at my right hand, I shall not be moved. Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth (this is the spiritual experience); my flesh also shall rest in hope (dwell confidently—margin). Here we have the physical security. Young translates this verse,

> "Therefore hath my heart been glad,
> And my honor doth rejoice,
> Also my flesh dwelleth confidently."
> Ps. xvi. 9.

Perfect submission and consecration to the Lord Jesus will inevitably bring about that mysterious union with Him, in which He, with the Father and the Spirit, will take up His abode in our souls and bodies. Nothing short of this is *complete*

Christianity. *Christ must be formed in us.* The Spirit must be in us. We must enter the holiest through the veil of His flesh, and abide continually in the very presence of God. Instead of being appalled at the height of the standard, let us remember the infinite promises of an infinite Saviour, and enter into that marvellous life of faith wherein, as little children, we believe God without a question, and enjoy the benefits that can only flow through faith.

CHAPTER VII.

Review and Conclusions.

"Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you."—1 Pet. iii. 15.

"In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves."—2 Tim. ii. 25.

"I will speak of thy testimonies also before kings, and will not be ashamed."—Ps. cxix. 46.

"But when they shall lead you, and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate; but whatever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost."—Mark xiii. 11.

THE forgoing argument has not been founded on a "single text of Scripture," but upon great and fundamental principles underlying and pervading the entire Word. It may be well to briefly recapitulate the Biblical facts and salient points which have been advanced. I have not written this book to prove the doctrine of Christian Holiness, for there is an abundance of literature on that subject, but have briefly glanced at the general principles which underlie that experience. We have seen in Chapter I, that the Atonement provides for the pardon of all past sins, and the cleansing from all past unrighteousness. In Chapter II the glorious provisions for the cleansing from all inbred sin were briefly discussed. Chapter

III brought us to the question of bodily healing, as provided for in the Atonement. After a few pointed instances of modern healing in answer to prayer, the resemblance in the nature of the testimony for soul and body was pointed out, and then we passed to the general question of miracles, their reasonableness and probability. After this the special Scriptural grounds were considered at some length. I will not occupy space in reprinting the verses in full, but will simply give them by number, in the order as used.

Isaiah 53d chapter, verses 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12.
Exodus xv. 26. xxiii. 25.
Deut. vii. 15. xxxii. 39.
Psalm cv. 37. cxvi. 9.
The case of Miriam, Numbers xii. 13.
Numbers xvi. 47, 48. xxi 4–9.
Deut. v. 16. and v. 33. iv. 40. xii. 25, 28. xxii. 7.
Eph. vi. 3.
Deut. vii. 12–15. xxviii. 15–61.
2. Chron. vii. 12–14.
Job. 33d chapter.
Psalm vi. 2, 9. xli. 2. lxxviii. 20–22.
Ninety-first Psalm.
Psalm ciii. 1–5. 107th Psalm.
Jno. i. 4. 1 Jno. v. 11, 12.
Prov. iv. 20–22. iii. 7, 8. xii. 28. xiv. 27. xv. 7.
Eccles. vii. 12–17.
Jeremiah xvii. 14.
Ezekiel xxxiv. 4, 16.
Matt. iv. 4, and Deut. viii. 3.
Matt. xiv. 36.
Jno. iv. 14. Matt. x. 1–10.
Mark vi. 12, 13.
Luke ix. 1, 2, 6. x. 1, 9, 17, 18, 19.
Mark xvi. 17, 18.
Acts iv. 29, 30.
1 Cor. vi. 13. 2 Cor. i. 20.
Eph. v. 23–30. Heb. xi. 11.
Gal. iii. 13. Lev. xxvi. etc. etc.

The proposition considered was that sickness is from the devil. Job's case is conclusive.—Acts x. 38, and Luke xiii. 11–17, together with Paul's "minister of Satan," settle all controversy upon this point. We read also the following Scriptures:

Dan. ix. 24. Heb. ii. 14, 15. 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54. 1 Jno. iii. 8.

Next, the great importance of our physical bodies, was presented, in contrast to that doleful view of the case expressed in the hymn beginning,

> "Come on my partners in distress
> Companions in this wilderness
> Who still your bodies feel."

In this connnection see Rom. vi. 6; Gen. xviii. 14; 2 Cor. xii. 9; Rom. viii. 22, 23; 2 Cor. v. 1–4; Rom. xii. 1; 1 Cor. vi. 13, 15; 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; Eph. ii. 22; Heb. iii. 6; 1 Peter ii. 5; Phil. i. 20; Col. ii. 17; 1 Thess. v. 23; Jude ix.

The book of Leviticus was then reviewed to show the analogy from the character of the priesthood, as well as the plain directions for the healing of bodily disease, and specially for the offering of an "atonement" for sickness. See Lev. xi. 44; xii. 6, 7, 8, with Gen. iii. 16; Lev. xiv. chapter, also xv. These give the distinct command that an "*atonement*" *was to be offered* for *sickness and disease*. There is no avoiding this point. Lev. xxi. gives the close parallel in the case of the priests. See also Heb. ix. 22, and x. 22; 1 Peter. ii. 9; Ex. xix. 5, 6; Rev. i. 6; Heb. x. 19–22. Rev. Samuel Wakefield was quoted as saying that "the law required a sacrificial atonement, even for bodily disorders."

Next we considered the question, Who may be healed? Under this head a number of references were used. Gen. xx. 17; Num. xii. 13; 1 Kings viii. 37–39, and 2 Chr. vi. 28–30; 2 Kings v.; and xx. 5; 2 Chr. xxx. 20; Psalm vi. 2; xxvii. 1; xxx. 2, 3; xli. 3; Mal. iv. 2; Psalm liv. 22; lx. 11. The

utter absence of any possible recommendation of physicians from the whole Scripture was then noted, and the reason clearly traced in the full provision made for bodily healing through the Great Physician. Matt. xxviii. 18, 20; Heb. xiii. 8; Mark xvi. 17, 18; Rom. xii. 3; 1 Cor. ii. 5; 2 Cor. i. 20. The twelfth chapter of 1 Cor. needs special consideration, and admits of no denial or explanation; the plain fact of the existence of all the "gifts" in the Christian church being there established, beyond any possible controversy.

Reading Phil. ii. 25–27, and James ii. 22, we came to James v. 13, 14, 15, and considered the the plain and perfect way and means there laid down for the church. The "sin unto death" called for special attention, bringing before our minds some of the causes which prevent the use of the promises for bodily healing. Then the subject of the keeping power of Jesus, applied to preserve us from sickness, in Chapter IV., closed the direct argument; while Chapter V. was occupied with the most conspicuous objections to the doctrine of faith-healing, and Chapter VI. to the glorious, rounded, completeness of our FULL SALVATION.

CONCLUSIONS.

Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners; to save them now from every sin, from all inbred depravity, from outbreaking sickness and from the inworking germs of disease.

If we sin, it is because of at least temporary, unbelief; and if we are sick, the reason is similar. It may be that the unbelief is manifested in our refusal to see the leadings of God's Spirit, but all is best summed up in the one word—unbelief. "Are not these evils come upon us because our God is not among us?"—Deut. xxxi. 17.

Sickness and sin are alike the work of the devil. Neither, is ever "necessary," in any true sense. God permits Satan to try us simply because we *will not* listen to His voice. Bodily illness is *allowed* therefore as a corrective, or better as the task-master's lash to make us weary of bondage, and ready to follow the leaders God sends. In precisely the same way we fall into sin, not because it is "necessary to keep us humble," but because our stiff necks will not bend. As in the case of Joseph, God brings good out of evil, for the smart of our sins leads us to cry unto God, whereupon He delivers us out of our distresses. All this tends to open our eyes by degrees to the great truth, that salvation is meant for our whole being—body, soul and spirit. I hope this conclusion is clear. Sin and sickness *may* be used or allowed as corrections. They are not *necessary*

however. We can be free from either, or both, as soon as we find Jesus, through faith, as the complete Burden-Bearer. If we are falling under either it is not a sign that we are being kept humble, but rather that we are not yet humble enough to give up everything and believe everything.

The physical body is not a cage; it should not be considered an embarrassment at all. On the contrary the man who says he could be good if it were not for his bodily appetites, simply acknowledges that his "heart is not right" before God. The heart is the fountain, and if that be purified thoroughly, all the bodily appetites will work normally and properly. The body is to be offered to God as a sacrifice, just as much as the soul. We will never be glorified till our bodies are changed. Our bodies are, or should be, actual temples of the Holy Ghost, and not merely "halls of theology."

Any one may be healed who is drawn of the Spirit to seek healing. The promise is to "any sick among you." At the same time there is a "sin unto death." In this case, however, it is about certain, that true faith will be sensibly wanting. This "sin unto death" may be fully pardoned, and consist with a deep spiritual experience of God's love, as in the case of Moses.

The "means" of healing laid down in James, present a perfect way. We must consecrate all to Jesus, relinquish everything contrary to His will, and be absolutely ready to be, to do, or to suffer all things for Him.

Physicians are mercifully provided for those who can not trust God alone. No one can thus

trust God who knowingly withholds anything, however slight. Medicines of course can not share God's glory. They stand upon precisely the same ground with the physicians, and serve to demonstrate the abounding love of God to an unbelieving world.

The whole tenor of Scripture is to the effect that God is the Healer of sickness as well as of sin. Under the old dispensations this was abundantly and repeatedly set forth, even to the extent of a special direction for an "atonement" offering in the case of many diseases. Under the new dispensation, this feature of physical healing was most particularly emphasized, in word and deed; and we have the special assurance that Jesus came to fulfill the law and not to destroy it.

The Scriptures for the vicarious Atonement for sin are no more explicit than those for sickness; the same words or phrases being used for both. Jesus is positively said to have born our sins and our diseases; and this statement is abundantly exemplified and expounded, as we have seen.

We must exercise sanctified common sense and not fly to the extreme of expecting God to enable us to bid defiance to the laws of health, unless *most unmistakably* led of the Spirit to do so temporarily. Such leading is rare.

The devil is a beaten foe, and does not know half as much as we have supposed. He is not God, and can not tell the future. Nevertheless he must not be despised, but ever regarded as an enemy whom only Jesus can overcome.

Close communion with God develops the faculty of receiving actual life for soul and body, an inspiration or in-breathing of the life of Jesus. And this life becomes a "well of water springing up into everlasting life."

Jesus started His church with a double charter which has never been revoked. "Preach the gospel and heal the sick." The Apostles set the example of asking for "signs and wonders" to attend their work; and Paul distinctly enjoins the church to "covet" these miraculous gifts "earnestly," while James plainly directs their use in the healing of "any sick."

The "body is for the Lord," and is not a worthless lump of clay. If a human body was good enough for the Son of God, we ought not to complain of ours.

All sickness was and is included under the "curse of the law." This is again and again declared in Scripture. But "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, *being made a curse for us*." Either this declaration is false, or Jesus bore my disease for me, just as he bore my sins. If I am compelled to bear them also, then His work was incomplete. But He declared, with His dying breath, "It is finished."

The miracles of Jesus were not merely to prove His divinity, but were the natural outflow of that divinity, when brought into close contact with suffering humanity; and their continuance testifies to the Headship of the risen Savior in His connection with the Church.

He who "touches" Jesus, always receives life. Satan could not inflict sickness upon Job till God gave His permission; and this permission was given solely to lead Job to a deeper death of self. As soon as the lesson was learned, the sickness was taken away. So we can be sure that God will not allow Satan to whip us after we have apprehended and received the intended instruction. "Before I was afflicted I went astray, but now have I kept thy word."—Ps. cxix. 67.

The body, which gives us so much trouble, is not the body of flesh, but the "body of sin." When this is crucified we can live the resurrection life in Christ, and the body of flesh will be in perfect accord with the divine will.

The dietary laws of Moses are for our good to-day, just as much as they were for the Jews. He who thinks he can slight the stomach, as of small account, opens a thousand doors to disease and suffering.

The devil kills a great many good people long "before their time."

Healing may be instantaneous, but is more likely to be gradual, because of the imperfect consecration and faith in so many patients. Gradual restoration gives the opportunity for education.

A sin which has caused sickness is necessarily forgiven when the disease is removed. This James specially declares, v. 15.

There is no more necessity for us to be sick than to sin. If then we are wholly the Lord's, and rest in His Word, we may enjoy health of body and of

soul. This requires the closest attention to the voice of God. We must not dare to slight the least of His commands. *There are no little things in the life of faith.* And we must give God the glory.

We may be tempted with sickness, just as we are tempted with sin. By faith in Jesus one may be resisted just as well as the other. The temptation will then be useful, and we may "count it all joy." Paul's "vile body" was simply his body in a "low estate,"—not yet glorified.

Trophimus was undoubtedly healed, but not until he was separated from Paul, according to the divine purpose.

Paul's thorn in the flesh, if a sickness, was certainly from the devil. It did not hinder his work, and there can be no doubt it was removed by the power of God alone. This thing was allowed as a precautionary measure, to teach him the deepest humility, and of course was removed when the lesson was learned.

Spiritual blessings invariably precede or accompany bodily healing. Faith is always the vehicle for God's bounty.

"Chastening" requires the presence of Satan. There are no tears in heaven, no "chastening," no trials. Sickness, death and sin are always unrelenting enemies, and emanate from the devil.

Faith-healing does not affect the necessity of dying, provided our time arrives before the Bridegroom cometh. We are not, however, to look for death as a friend, but earnestly "hasten the coming of the Lord," keeping the glorious possibility of translation constantly before our eyes.

The days of miracles have not passed. On the contrary we may expect greater wonders than the world has ever seen, for such is the express declaration of the Word. The day of the Lord hasteth greatly, and the miracles preceding and attending His second advent will be more remarkable than anything ever recorded in the past. The supernatural always slumbers when faith lies sleeping, or dead.

The only "means" *needed* for the sick, are the Scriptural ones of "laying on of hands, anointing with oil," and, "the prayer of faith." The Bible never advises us to trust in any one or anything but in God. He who would know God's power must walk humbly in God's pathway.

Those who reject God's ways are influenced by ignorance, or by the idea that they are wiser than the written Word; by pride, or by unbelief. Like the Jews they become very angry when told the plain truth concerning themselves.

There is not the faintest hint in Scripture that oil was commanded or used as a medicine, rather than as a symbol. We have abundant testimony to the existence of thousands of remedies at the beginning of the Christian era.

The "Elders of the Church" are God made Elders, and not merely ordained of man. Before proceeding in any special work for God, we should be very sure that we are called of the Spirit, and that we are in no way influenced by personal ambition.

There is no doubt of the existence of "gifts of

healing" in the church to-day. These gifts never were exercised at the discretion of the possessor, nor ever used for the mere purpose of proving anything for the benefit of unbelievers of any grade.

The foundation of the doctrine of faith-healing is the Word of God, and not visible results. *Apparent* failures count for nothing. "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall never pass away."

The devil is the sole author of the notion that he cannot now "possess" men's bodies, as in former times. He is very anxious to have men think lightly of him. Despising an enemy gives him a great advantage. That was how David came to kill Goliath.

Paul's experience with his thorn, like Job's sickness, is not an exception, but a representative case. Both are paralleled constantly in individual cases to-day.

God always honors faith, even if it be clouded and enveloped in ignorance. It is "according to *thy* faith," not according to the faith of Moses or the apostles. Each man's faith is his own, and no matter how ignorant, if he trusts God, God saves him.

We can glorify God in sickness by showing His wonderful power to sustain; but we can glorify Him better by giving an opportunity for His delivering power. *Jesus came to preach "deliverance to the captives," not exactly to feed them in prison.* A long continued affliction *may* indicate an obstinate refusal to follow Jesus entirely.

It is just as possible to refuse the passage of Jordan for sickness, and to be turned back to struggle with disease and to die in the wilderness of affliction, as this experience is possible in spiritual matters.

We must walk in the fire in this world, but if Jesus walks with us, the smell of fire need not pass upon us.

God's rod is a rod of power and deliverance, as well as of destroying might. There is a law of life, as well as a law of death. When we talk of the law, we should remember the life side as well as the other. God condemns according to one, and saves by the other.

Let people who believe it is God's will that they shall be sick, prove their belief by relinquishing all efforts to get well; give up their medicines and save the money spent on physicians.

The way to find God's will is to read His Word, in the Spirit of Paul, "believing all things which are written in the law and the prophets."—Acts xxiv. 14.

The petition "Thy will be done," can only be perfectly offered by one whose spirit, soul and body have been placed absolutely in Jesus' hands.

"Signs" never have followed, and never can follow those who do not believe in the "signs." They follow those who, like the Apostles, pray for God's miraculous power, and heartily believe it will be manifested.

The evidences of miraculous power always multiply when faith becomes concentrated, simple and absolute.

God may use an infinite variety of agents or laws for the recovery of the sick. He may use the patients' imagination or anything else. The only question is, who produced the effect? If God did it he should have the glory.

A miracle is not a violation of natural law, but the superposition of another law. God's laws are never *violated*; they can not be. It is a natural law that anything material will be attracted towards the earth. An inflated balloon, however, leaves the earth, but not in violation of gravitation. On the contrary it is because of gravitation drawing down the heavier air all around the balloon. The balloon is attracted, according to law; but another law steps in, and through their combination a very different effect is produced.

The proper definition of a miracle is, anything which transcends human power. It would be just as great a miracle for a man to jump one hundred feet as one million miles, because both are absolutely impossible *to man*. All the talk about a miracle being a reversal of some great natural law is fundamentally absurd. There is every reason to believe that natural laws are never reversed, but only modified through combinations with other laws. The idea that a miracle consists in the performance of inherent impossibilities, is most absurd of all. God is the perfection of harmony and equity. Two and two, added together, give four. This is truth; and as God, who changes not, is, or holds, the essence of truth, we simply testify to this attribute when we say, no miracle can or will

ever change this numerical relation. Thoughtful men need to open their eyes to this fact. God answers prayer through the operations of law. Indeed He has established the *law of prayer*; "If we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us." If He heals the sick, it is through and according to law. If He opens a pathway through the sea it is by the operation of law. (Ex. xiv. 21.) If mighty changes are made in the topography of a continent, such as those prophesied in Zech. xiv. 4, it will be according to law. A few months ago a mountain split in two in far distant Alaska; and a dozen mountains rose out of the waters of the straits of Sunda. Wherein will the dividing of the Mount of Olives be more distinctly miraculous than these? We can not tell how the bones of a child are formed, nor how the acorn expands into the oak; but we know both are facts. So far as we are concerned they are just as miraculous as the instantaneous restoration of the withered arm.

Why should we undertake to make time the test of the miraculous when the Actor is He with whom "a day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day?"

We must not be discouraged if the answer appears to be delayed, but diligently seek for possible hindrances in ourselves. "Though it tarry, wait for it, for it will surely come." Healing in Scripture was not always instantaneous. It is, moreover, extremely probable, that the most remarkable cases were narrated in detail.

We may be gradually healed because of imper-

fect faith, incomplete consecration, or heedlessness of the Spirit's leadings.

The church is sadly in need of *Quadrangular Christians;* those who have found out that Salvation has four sides—committed sin, inbred sin, mental trouble and bodily sickness.

The church, like the apostles, can not cast out devils or perform other wonderful works, *because of unbelief.* The average Christian misses the rounded experience of the saints solely through unbelief. He will not believe it to be his duty to at once consecrate *everything* to God; or he will not believe God's promises to be in the present tense.

The way to "hasten the coming of the Lord," is to really believe He is coming, and to act accordingly. The day is drawing near when faith will be necessary to a part in the first resurrection.

Even translation will be through and according to the *law of faith.* He that believes that Jesus is not coming, however devout he may be, will surely be left behind. The wise virgins were those who watched. *Watching means expecting.*

If the world is to be converted, apostolic faith and power are needed.

When Satan says, "The day of miracles has passed," *he* means to insinuate that God is dead. He chuckles prodigiously over any departure from a supernatural faith in a supernatural God, ever present and ready to literally perform His promises.

Holiness is undoubtedly much more important than bodily healing; but we should never forget

that the "day of our redemption" will never come till each "spirit, soul, and body" is "sanctified wholly" from every touch of evil.

Beloved, let us not be left behind for want of asking. Let us pray for grace, for faith, for power, for love, for fire, and even for the miraculous manifestations of a miraculous Saviour, that we may "speak the word with all boldness," and that men, especially Christians, may be convinced that our "glorious Lord" is not chained by His own decrees, nor disposed to alter the meaning of His own language.

Finally; I am "preaching peace by Jesus Christ." (Acts x. 36.) Peace from all sin. Not a rest from conflict, but a rest from defeat. Peace from all sickness, yes peace from all taint of evil. "Preaching peace by Jesus Christ." What a glorious Savior we have! What a perfect salvation! How transcendent His glory! how deep His mercy! how unsearchable His love! How free is His grace! how boundless His compassion! how inexhaustible His resources! how enduring His promises! "The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms." (Deut xxxiii. 27.) How strong are those arms! How mighty is His power! Jesus paid it all, all the debt I owe; then why should I be striving to pay a portion of it over again? I fly to the mighty Jesus; to Him who has "all power in heaven and earth," and I find "perfect peace" when my "mind is stayed" upon Him alone. I do not find this peace perfect when I "put confidence in men" for

a portion of my safety. I want Jesus to have all the glory, and so I trust the "everlasting arms" to hold me without tying myself up by means of man's devising. Thus I have peace. And oh! such peace! How profound; how unfathomable! "Preaching peace by Jesus Christ." Praise the Lord for what follows. Peter adds, "he is Lord of all." Yes I am determined He shall be Lord of *all*. "That word, I say, ye know, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached; *How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him. And we are witnesses of all things which he did.*"

This is the kind of peace I preach. Peace that brings freedom from the touch of the devil. How glorious it is to know Jesus as a perfect Savior in the present tense! "My soul doth magnify the Lord" for all His benefits towards me. "He hath given me rest round about." "He loved my soul from the pit of corruption."—(Isa. xxxviii. 17 margin). "God is the Lord which hath shewed us light."—Ps. cxviii. 27. "Light is sown for the righteous, and gladness for the upright in heart." —Ps. xcvii. 11. "For the Lord God is a sun and shield; the Lord will give grace and glory; no good thing will he withhold from them that walk uprightly."—Ps. lxxiii. 23. "I will go in the strength of the Lord."—Ps. lxxi. 16. "Let God be magnified."—Ps. lxx. 4. "The God of Israel is

he that giveth strength and power unto his people." "Unto God the Lord belong the issues from death."—Ps. lxviii. 35, 20. "O bless our God which holdeth our soul in life."—Ps. lxvi. 9. "O thou that hearest prayer, unto thee shall all flesh come."—Ps. lxv. 2. "I will cry unto God most high; unto God who performeth all things for me."—Ps. lvii. 2. "It is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in man."—Ps. cxviii. 8. "Thy God hath commanded thy strength."—Ps. lxviii. 28. "Call upon me in the day of trouble: I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me."—Ps. l. 15. "I will praise thee forever, because thou hast done it."—Ps. lii. 9. "Come and hear, all ye that fear God, and I will declare what he hath done for my soul."—Ps. lxvi. 16. "For this God is our God for ever and ever; he will be our guide even unto death."—Ps. xlviii. 14. "O clap your hands all ye people; shout unto God with the voice of triumph."—Ps. xlvii. 1.

Oh, this peace! how it deepens and broadens and flows!—Isa. xlviii. 18, and xxvi. 3, and lxvi. 12; Ps. cxix. 165; John xiv. 27.

"MY PEACE."

When Peace like a river flows over my soul,
Away, to the darkness infernal,
My troubles, my cares, and infirmities roll;
I bathe in the waters eternal.

I drink from the river of life, as it flows
Straight down from the city resplendent;
The Peace of my soul toward infinitude grows,
My joy is supreme and transcendent.

"O not as the world giveth, give I to thee;"
My Jesus, the only Peace-Giver,
Thy Spirit alone bringeth sweet liberty;
"My Peace" floweth on like a river.

"My Peace,"—what a token of infinite Love,
My deepest devotion commanding;
Unchanging, and pure, gracious Heavenly Dove,
"My Peace" passeth all understanding.

"My Peace" like a river flows over my soul,
No shadow my path is o'er-casting;
But billows of light in omnipotence roll,
I joy in the life everlasting.

My mind, ever stayed, dearest Lord, upon Thee,
Beside the still waters I'm growing;
I'm trusting, rejoicing, restful, and free,
"My Peace" like a river is flowing.

"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth, peace, good will to men."—Luke ii. 14. "His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace."—Isa. ix. 6. "Beloved *now* are we the sons of God." Let us claim our heritage, for our Father saith "all that I have is thine." Let us be QUADRANGULAR CHRISTIANS.

"LET EVERYTHING THAT HATH BREATH PRAISE THE LORD."

THE CASE OF MRS. REBECCA S. FRAVEL.

In the note on page 22 reference is made to this case. Only the merest outline can be given here. *Liquor was the cause of the trouble.* Sometime in 1875 this lady was attacked because she would not deny her religious convictions, and most horribly injured. She was choked into insensibility, her back broken, the bones of the legs broken, the right hip and right shoulder dislocated, and her whole body covered with terrible bruises. In this condition, when the merest spark of life remained, after being examined by several physicians who refused to attempt to do anything for her, she was raised up by the power of God alone, and walked, besides using her right hand in signing her name, within twenty-four hours after the injuries were inflicted. Many of her friends and acquaintances, near Cincinnati, Ohio, were and are familiar with these facts, and medical testimony was given under oath concerning her injured condition. I am personally acquainted with the lady, and have had the privilege of meeting with several of her intimate friends. The evidence in the case is full, clear and voluminous, and no hasty sketch like this can begin to give any idea of the wonderful and continued manifestations of God's hand in her experience.

If the Lord wills, an extended account of this miracle of healing, with the evidence in full, may be published at an early date. It is my earnest conviction that God is sending upon His chosen people more and more of the "gifts of the Spirit," mentioned in 1 Cor. xii.; and that we may expect at any time to hear of the wonderful workings of Him, whose name is called "WONDERFUL, COUNSELLOR, THE MIGHTY GOD, THE EVERLASTING FATHER, THE PRINCE OF PEACE."

PRAISE THE LORD!

FINIS.

MIRACLES OF HEALING.

The cure, in answer to the prayer of faith of CAPT. R. KELSO CARTER, of the Pennsylvania Military Academy.

PAPER, 15 CENTS.

PASTOR BLUMHARDT.

A record of the Wonderful Spiritual and Physical Manifestations of God's power in Healing Souls and Bodies, through the prayers of this remarkable man.

By CAPT. R. KELSO CARTER,

CLOTH, 40 CENTS.

THE SUPERNATURAL GIFTS OF THE SPIRIT.

By THOMAS ERSKINE.

Edited by R. Kelso Carter, with Remarkable Cases of Modern Miracles.

PAPER, 10 CENTS.

TRACTS.

By THE SAME AUTHOR.

THE LEAVEN IN THE KINGDOM, . . .	2 c.
WHOLLY FOLLOWING THE LORD, . . .	3 c.
NICODEMUS' FOOLISH QUESTION, . . .	2 c.
THE TRINITY OF FAITH, ...	2 c.
SEVEN STEPS TO HOLINESS, ...	3 c.
IF IT BE THY WILL.—A word to the Sick, .	5 c.

Other Works on Faith Healing.

Dorothea Trudel; or, The Prayer of Faith,	$ 75
Faith Cures. By Dr. Cullis,	50
More Faith Cures. By Dr. Cullis,	50
Were They Miracles?	15
The Ministry of Healing. By Rev. A. J. Gordon, D. D.,	1 30
The Ministry of Healing (Tract),	03
The Great Physician. By Wm. E. Boardman, D. D.,	1 00
The Great Physician (Tract). By Mrs. Baxter,	03
God's Purpose in Sickness,	02
Good News to the Sick. C. H. Annesley,	05
Healing of Sickness; by Scriptural Means. By Karl Andreas,	20
Faith Healing. E. O. Allen,	15
The Word of the Lord Concerning Sickness,	15
Healing by Faith. Revs. Steele and Gracey,	10
Sickness and the Gospel. Pastor Stockmayer,	15
The Prayer of Faith. Carrie Judd,	25
Promises for Healing. Dr. G. D. Watson,	03

All these, and many others, can be obtained at the

WILLARD TRACT REPOSITORY,

Beacon Hill Place, Boston,

239 Fourth Avenue, New York.

813 Arch Street, Philadelphia.

Faith Healing" Reviewed

AFTER TWENTY YEARS.

By

REV. R. KELSO CARTER,

Author of "THE SECRET OF SOUL-SAVING."

"Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter."— Ecclesiastes xii. 13.

"The Spirit dividing to every man severally as he will."— I Cor. xii. 11.

BOSTON AND CHICAGO:
THE CHRISTIAN WITNESS COMPANY.
1897.

Copyright, 1897,
by
The Christian Witness Company.

DEDICATION.

To the Child of God, whether a member of the "Christian Alliance" or a "Divine Healing Association," or not, but who believes that any earnest soul MAY be mistaken, and who always desires to "know the truth" that the "truth may set him free,"—this book is prayerfully inscribed.

PREFACE.

THE "Faith Healing" of this book must be sharply distinguished from the "faith cures," so called, of "Christian Science," or the "Mind Cure." The following reasons will make this plain.

Mrs. Eddy and her school declare, "You are not sick; you have no disease."

We admit the facts of disease, and esteem it a falsehood to assert that there is no sickness present when we are actually ill.

"Christian Science" even sets at naught laws of health, for Mrs. Eddy says, "Bathing and brushing to remove unhealthy exhalation from the cuticle receives a useful rebuke from Christ's — healing, that makes not clean the outside of the platter."

We accept and teach the laws of health, sanitary and dietary, as found in the Bible and in the writings of the best scientists.

Mrs. Eddy states that "petitioning a personal God to do your work, or to enable you to do it. is not metaphysics wherein truth works."

The Faith Healing of the Christian comes from our God in answer to the direct "prayer of faith," for which see James v. 14–16.

These contrasts will suffice. The term "Faith Healing" was used by orthodox Christians long before Mrs. Eddy secured any recognition for her absurd system, and is retained here because of its strictly Biblical character.

In the Appendix a few special cases of unquestionable and positive cures are given for the benefit of honest inquirers after truth.

BALTIMORE, MD., June 22, 1897.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

CHAPTER I. — REASONS FOR WRITING . . . 9
Scope of Faith Healing. — Sketch of Progress. — Statement of the Theory. — Cui Bono?

CHAPTER II. — THE ATONEMENT THEORY STATED . 24
The *Century* Article in full.

CHAPTER III. — TESTING THE FOUNDATIONS . . 37
Old Testament Position that of "Law." — Good To-day. — Nature of Israel at time of Exodus. — Promises to the Nation, and "in the Land." — Cases of Old Testament examined. — Isaac, Jacob, Levi, David, Miriam, Samson, Job, Ahab. — Difference when we study the Sin Question. — Prayers of Old Testament. — Statement of Old Testament Position.

CHAPTER IV. — THE NEW TESTAMENT POSITION . 61
Contrast between Present and Time of Christ. — Did Jesus give New Law of Health? — Matt. viii. 17. — Christ bore Death and Sorrow. — Did Jesus set up the Atonement Theory? — Healing Incidental. — Christ's Mission according to Luke and Isaiah. — The "Earnest."

PAGE

CHAPTER V. — ST. JAMES ON HEALING . . . 83
The "Prayer of Faith." — The Gifts of the Spirit. — New Testament Position Stated.

CHAPTER VI. — CASES OF NEW TESTAMENT EXAMINED, 102

CHAPTER VII. — THE PRACTICAL POSITION . . 109
Dr. Cullis. — A. B. Simpson. — A. J. Gordon. — Carrie Judd Montgomery. — Mrs. Baxter. — John A. Dowie. — R. K. Carter.

CHAPTER VIII. — CONCLUSION 123
Dr. John G. Paton. — Charlie Miller. — "Spiritual Loss." — Mrs. Kelley. — Major Cole. — The Means of Faith.

APPENDIX 136
Cases of Healing. — Heart Disease. — Sciatica. — Prostration. — Broken Joint. — Consumption. — Cancer. — Neuralgia. — Cancer. — A Physician's Healing. — R. Kelso Carter's Case.

CLOSING REMARKS 162

CHAPTER I.

Reasons for Writing.

IN 1884 the writer published an octavo volume called "The Atonement for Sin and Sickness," of which two thousand copies were sold in about two years. In 1888 John B. Alden issued a rewritten, revised and much enlarged edition under the name of "Divine Healing; or, The Atonement," etc. During the next three or four years a number of thousands of this were sold, probably six or eight thousand in all.

Of this book leading notices were as follows:

"The best writing upon this subject. What the Bible has to say upon this subject has not before been given with such order and method." — *Inter-Ocean*, Chicago.

"The one idea of Capt. Carter's 'Divine Healing' is that the atonement of Christ is for the bodies of believers as well as for their souls. It is a strong and not unduly enthusiastic presentation of that theory." —*Examiner*, New York City.

"It is a pretty hard matter to read it and lay it aside without believing in the Faith Cure." — *Express*, Easton, Pa.

"This book is the leading authority on the subject; it is in part reprinted from the *Century Magazine*. Even those who have no faith in the 'cure' want to know what one of its honest and ablest advocates has to say about it."

The above quotations, coupled with the fact that the Glossary of Scripture texts used in the book shows a total of three hundred and sixty different passages which are in some way considered, will abundantly sustain the statement of the *Inter-Ocean* that such an extensive Biblical treatment had not been given before. From a thorough acquaintance with all the important literature on this topic it may be added that up to the present time nothing has appeared which attempts to cover the whole ground gone over in this book. (Hereafter we will refer to it as D. H., and give page references from the revised edition only.)

Before the issue of D. H. Dr. Cullis had printed two small volumes under the caption of "Faith Cures." He had also published the life of Dorothea Truedel. The first mentioned contained no special doctrine, but merely the relations of many cases of cure in answer to prayer, some of them very remarkable. "Dorothea Truedel" gave an interesting account of the work at Mannedorf, Switzerland, and furnished some cases of

cures through prayer. A little later Dr. William Boardman put forth his "Great Physician," which was a move in the doctrinal direction, and to a considerable extent developed the subject from a general study of Scripture bearing upon it. Carrie Judd of Buffalo (now Mrs. George Montgomery of Beulah, Cal.) had printed her "Prayer of Faith," which, besides giving in detail her own extraordinary restoration to health in answer to prayer, made a brief attempt to present the matter as suitable for all believers.

Then followed the late Dr. A. J. Gordon (whose personal friendship the writer afterwards enjoyed and prized) with his admirable study of faith cures in all ages of the church, under the name of "The Ministry of Healing." Besides these may be mentioned such pamphlets as "Faith Healing," by Ethan Allen, an old saint of Springfield, Mass., and a small booklet by one Karl Andreas of London, England. A very few articles on the subject from the pen of Rev. A. B. Simpson of New York were also issued before the first edition of D. H. saw the light. But however excellent these books may have been as presentations of the subject, no one of them, nor indeed all put together, approached the exhaustive Biblical consideration given in D. H. Let

it be understood we are not speaking of merit at all, but simply of the field covered.

In the years that have passed since D. H. first appeared, several books have been added to the list above given. Pastor Stockmayer of Switzerland put forth two editions of "Sickness and the Gospel." "Our Lord's Permanent Healing Office in His Church," by Rev. George Morris, appeared in London. "Faith Healing: a Defence," by R. L. Marsh, a Yale student, was published by Revell in 1889; and later the same house issued "A Study of Faith Healing," by Alfred T. Schofield, M. D. Before this the life of Pastor Blumhardt of Bad Boll, Germany, was published on the continent, containing some most marvellous accounts of healing; and the writer prepared a small English booklet on that remarkable man, which was issued by the Willard Tract Repository of Boston. He also issued a small pamphlet called "Supernatural Gifts of the Spirit," dealing with the existence of the miraculous gifts in modern times, somewhat as was done by the great Horace Bushnell in his famous work, "Nature and the Supernatural." Schofield's work alluded to is rather an adverse study of the subject, but the others are all in favor of "Faith Healing." In 1892 Rev.

William McDonald of Boston put out a small book on "Modern Faith Healing," striving to show from the New Testament that the special answer to prayer is the proper ground, and not the general provision in the Atonement for all believers. This same ground was taken by the learned Dr. Daniel Steele in two little tracts issued about the close of the decade. Meanwhile Rev. A. B. Simpson of New York published several small books on the general subject, partly narratives of experience and partly doctrinal, but never issued a complete treatise covering the whole ground.

Rev. John A. Dowie, the Australian, now in Chicago, though the most robust advocate of the extreme theory, has never attempted to issue any exhaustive work upon the subject, his publications being almost wholly of the nature of narratives of cures in which he has had some part. His paper, "Leaves of Healing," contains many experiences as told in his meetings, but very little doctrine. In his sermons, however, he goes into the matter with characteristic Scotch pugnacity, and takes the most radical ground.

Up to this present time no work has appeared which attempts the systematic study of the whole Scriptures in order, from Genesis to Revelation, aiming to omit

nothing whatever bearing upon the topic, and to logically prove from all the sacred writings a consistent theory, and which at the same time takes up *seriatim* all the objections advanced by any writer of importance, except D. H. In it may be found treated every point so far advanced by any and all the advocates above quoted, and about every objection presented from any and every standpoint. As a simple statement of fact, and in order to show that it is not necessary to go outside this book in the present consideration of the theme, these things have to be said.

Again, the first call for a "convention" to consider the matter of Faith Healing specifically was issued by George McCalla and R. K. Carter, from Philadelphia, in June, 1882. A copy of this call is now before me. The convention was held, some attending from as distant a point as Kansas; but it was small, and of no particular consequence except to those immediately concerned. In June, 1885, a great conference was held in Agricultural Hall [illegible]lington, England, to which the writer was specially invited, with others from this country, but was unable to attend.

In March, 1887, following some severe articles against the theory, written by Drs. Schauffler and Buckley of

New York, the *Century Magazine* published an article on "Divine Healing" by R. Kelso Carter, which has so far proved to be the only article of the kind ever admitted to the columns of such a periodical. That article is embodied in this book, as the best condensed statement of the theory available, and as expressing very nearly the minds of the most prominent advocates of the belief that the Atonement provides healing by faith for all who will accept it.

In this country Dr. Charles Cullis began to pray with the sick about twenty years ago. In answer to his prayer, the writer was healed of stubborn heart disease in September, 1879, and being very closely associated with the doctor in most of his large conventions at Old Orchard Beach, Intervale, and Beacon Hill Church, Boston, as well as in his own home on terms of the closest friendship, he feels fully qualified to speak positively of Dr. Cullis's teaching and faith and practice. Several of these conventions at Old Orchard Beach, Me., were held during the summer seasons, and attended by many thousands who there heard of the "prayer of faith" as Dr. Cullis and others spoke of it in the open meetings; and at one special service during each convention the doctor personally anointed with oil and prayed with all

believers in Jesus who desired him to do so. The regular preaching of "faith healing" was not a feature of any convention held by Dr. Cullis, he always insisting on holding the three preaching services of each day to the one theme of salvation from sin, as he never failed to see that the soul is of much greater importance than the body. In the opening minutes of the special prayer service for the sick, already alluded to, Dr. Cullis was wont to speak briefly on the subject, not exactly doctrinally, but rather experimentally, relating how he came to study James v. 14, 15, expressing his firm and unshaken belief of every word between the covers of the precious Book of God, and urging his hearers to simply give all to God, claim the promises, and trust God to fulfil them.

During the years 1881–85 in this country existed the "wonder" stage of the modern development of "Faith Healing," the daily press taking up the subject and reporting remarkable cases of cure at considerable length. Many times the writer has been compelled to sit down with a reporter at Old Orchard Beach, or elsewhere, and endeavor to answer his queries in such a way as to insure the nearest approach to the truth reaching the public. Some of the cases of cures in those days

attracted wide notice, and were discussed by secular and religious papers at great length, calling out expressions of approval or condemnation, but tending always to spread the interest in the subject and to awaken faith in many earnest minds.

About the middle of this period, Rev. A. B. Simpson of New York, who had withdrawn from the Presbyterian Church in order to give himself more entirely to work among the masses of the city, visited us at Old Orchard during the Dr. Cullis convention, and after remaining a few days, went up to Intervale in the White Mountains, and there was himself healed of heart trouble. Returning to New York, Dr. Simpson began the work which, in a dozen years, has developed into a large and active church, the largest missionary training college in the country, and a foreign missionary movement under the "Christian Alliance," the growth of which has been most phenomenal. In all his teachings Dr. Simpson has given a little more prominence to "Faith Healing" than Dr. Cullis did, but has never allowed the subject to claim more than a fraction of time or attention, holding, as Cullis did, that the spiritual matters are much more important. With Dr. Simpson, in very many of his conventions, the writer has also been most closely

associated, though never in any way connected with his work.

About 1887 or 1888 there came to the Pacific coast an Australian Congregational preacher of Scotch birth, named John Alexander Dowie. Mr. Dowie had become famous in Australia for his positive advocacy of "Faith Healing," and had preached it over most of the important cities of that country. His presentation of the subject was quite radical, and, unlike our American teachers who had preceded him, he gave the whole of his time, or most of it, to this one theme. He remained on the Pacific coast some two years, and in the summer of 1889 came to Chicago, near which the writer met him and carefully listened to his entire course of "lectures" on the subject. No specially new points were presented, all being fully covered in D. H. or some of the other books already mentioned; but the Scot enforced his words with characteristic energy, and by mere dint of incessant hammering and a vehement personality persuaded many to adopt his views. For several years after coming to Chicago his work did not attract a great deal of attention, but during the World's Fair crowds began to flock to his tabernacle, and since that time he has carried on quite an extensive work,

during which many cases of healing have occurred. For a time Mr. Dowie was severely condemned by the press of Chicago, and suffered much unjust persecution at the hands of some whose opposition had been aroused, but at latest advices he was still prosecuting his work with vigor, and the storm of persecution had somewhat abated.

The "nine-days wonder" concerning Faith Healing has long ago subsided. The daily press no longer concerns itself with the cases of to-day, unless some circumstances conspire to make it very peculiar, or on account of some purely local interest. The theory, however, has added many believers in all parts of the world, and most of the teachers and writers mentioned have continued to advocate it in their meetings and writings. Some modifications have appeared, and some extremes have been marked in the positions held by leading faith healers, but in general the belief may still be expressed in the language and terms used in D. H. In its most condensed form it may be quoted from D. H., page 57, where recourse is had to the syllogism as follows:

"1. All forms of sickness and disease were included, and even mentioned particularly, in the 'curse of the

law.' Ex. xv., Ex. xxiii.; Lev. xxvi.; Deut. vii., Deut. xxii ; etc.

"2. 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law.' Therefore Christ hath redeemed us from all sickness and disease. There is no future tense about it; the work is finished. Again,

"1. Christ redeemed us from sin by His vicarious Atonement; that is 'he was made sin for us.'

"2. Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, by being made a curse for us. Therefore we are redeemed from all the 'curse of the law,' body, soul and spirit, solely through his vicarious Atonement."

On page 166 we read: "The Scriptures for the vicarious Atonement for sin are no more explicit than those for sickness; the same words or phrases being used for both. Jesus is positively said to have borne our sins and our diseases," etc.

Again, from page 146: "There is not a law given under Moses that is plainer and more positive than the law of physical health in Ex. xv. 26. And there is not a command given under the gospel more explicit and more clear in its attendant promise than the direction to the sick in James v. 14, 15. We believe that Jesus actually 'bore our sins in his own body on the tree,'

and consequently we do not have to remain in sin. And we read that 'himself took our infirmities, and bore our sicknesses.' How then can we possibly fail to see that 'by his stripes we are healed,' in body as well as in soul?"

CUI BONO?

It is always in order for one who has made a mistake to confess it. It is always good to state the truth of a matter, if it be stated at all. It is always the part of a true follower of Jesus to promptly get off a side-track to the main line when the discovery of position is made, and to do all in one's power to assist those who have been led astray from the exact truth to see clearly.

Not every man can be made to see his mistake, and of those who can, only a few are willing and ready to confess and make reparation. The general tendency is to avoid publicity, and to "hedge" until one gradually becomes known to have changed sides. The writer never had any disposition to so act in this matter. Over and over he was accustomed to say that he only cared for the plain sense of the Scriptures, and that no one would be more prompt than he to tell it far and wide if he saw he had misread the Bible. For the last

half dozen years he has seen clearly that TO A DEGREE this has been the case, and during all that time he has desired greatly to write this "review," but has been prevented by circumstances beyond his control. Meanwhile the private request of many thoughtful friends that it should be published has weighed heavily on his mind, and he has only waited on the possibilities in order to comply.

But there exists another reason for this book. In all the writings in opposition to Faith Healing referred to, as, for example, those of Drs. Buckley and Schauffler, of Schofield and others, no one has ever attempted to step upon the solid Biblical foundation taken in D. H. and to discuss the real theology of the matter. Rev. William McDonald in his small book and Dr. Daniel Steele in his tracts deal with the subject doctrinally it is true, but neither of these attempts anything like a systematic answer to the exhaustive line of Biblical argument given in D. H., while the other writers quoted direct their efforts almost entirely to proving that there are no miraculous cures at all in these days, and that all the cases given currency may be explained on purely scientific lines. It is easy to see that the latter, therefore, never come within the pale of the real argument used

by all devout advocates of "Faith Healing," namely, the consecutive teaching of the Old and New Testaments upon the subject.

All this being true, it becomes the plain duty of the writer, in attempting to give his reasons for any change in his belief, to take up his own book and squarely meet it exactly on its own ground, showing just where and to what extent it was wrong. To this task we will now address ourselves as briefly as possible, and in the most prayerful spirit, for by the very nature of the subject we are treading upon holy ground in the estimation of countless thousands of devout Christians in all parts of the world. That this little book may be sent just as far as God can use it, is the earnest prayer of the writer.

CHAPTER II.

The Atonement Theory Stated.

SINCE D. H. has long been out of print it seems best to give in as condensed a form as possible the special theory therein advocated, in order that there may be clearly pointed out just where lay the element of error in its reasoning, and at the same time to what extent it was right. The article printed in the *Century Magazine* for March, 1887, will serve these purposes best, supplemented by special brief quotations as needed. We therefore reprint the article referred to in full:

DIVINE HEALING, OR "FAITH CURE."

A STATEMENT.

By way of explanation it may be said that the writer has been most intimately associated with the "faith-healing" movement ever since it first began to attract public attention in this country. Seven years ago he was healed of a stubborn case of organic heart disease, after the best physicians and the most favorable climate and manner of life had alike signally failed to afford relief. At

that time the literature concerning this subject was limited to two or three small books, besides such general works as Horace Bushnell's "Nature and the Supernatural;" but of late it has grown into a considerable library, experimental and theological. In the perusal of this mass of writing, and in the contributions which he has himself made to it, the writer has been necessarily placed in a position to speak with authority on the question, What is the doctrine and practice of Divine Healing, as presented by its most prominent advocates?

The object of this paper is to bring before the reader, as clearly as possible in such an exceedingly limited space, the real nature and ground for the doctrine that Jesus Christ has provided for believers the possibility of deliverance from the inward power of disease (as well as from sin), PROVIDED *we meet all the Divine conditions.*

THE AUTHORITY.

The only authority to which any real recognition is accorded is found in the Bible. To the Word of our God we bow with absolute submission. What God says we propose to believe, whether we have been so fortunate as to prove it in our own experience or not. With Daniel Webster, we "believe religion to be not a matter of demonstration, but of faith. God requires us to give credit to the truths which He reveals, not because we can prove them, but because He declares them." Individual cases of healing, or phenomena, are absolutely worthless as to the question before us. All the cases in the world have nothing whatever to do directly with the doctrine of Divine Healing, for the very simple reason that they are not and never have been made the basis or ground of

that doctrine. The only foundation is the Word of God, and hence the examination of cases *per se* has no direct bearing upon the subject. But few men seek soul salvation, and some who appear to seek are not saved. It would be dangerous logic that discovered in this fact an error in the scheme of salvation.

THE DOCTRINE.

Passing rapidly over the time when Abraham, Isaac and Jacob each sought the Lord as the direct healer of physical diseases (see Genesis xx., xxv., xxx.), we come to the date of the Exodus, when God specially undertook the salvation of His people. Presumptive evidence is strongly in favor of the transmission of medical knowledge from the long-lived antediluvians, through Shem, who outlived Abraham, to the learned Egyptians of the time of Moses; but direct evidence is conclusive as to the advanced state of this knowledge. Clement of Alexandria (second century) mentions six hermetic books of Egyptian medicine, one of which was devoted to surgical instruments; and the learned George Ebers abundantly proves from ancient papyri that there were colleges of medicine, medical specialists and much skill in surgery before the days of Moses. Herodotus also testifies upon this point. But "Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," hence he must have possessed the highest medical knowledge of his age. Notwithstanding all this, when the Exodus occurred God did not direct the people to go to Moses for treatment, but gave them, unasked, a clear and distinct promise of exemption from disease, on the condition of obedience. In Exodus xv. 26, we read, "If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice

of the Lord thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments, and keep all his statutes, I will put none of these diseases upon thee which I have brought upon the Egyptians; for I am the Lord that healeth thee" (or, I am the Lord thy healer).

This promise was tested again and again. Moses prayed for leprosy (Numbers xii. 13), and Aaron for the plague (Numbers xvi. 47, 48). The serpent's bite found its cure solely through faith (Numbers xxi. 9), and the pestilence vanished when David sacrificed (II Samuel xxiv. 25). The Psalmist declares that when the children of Israel walked through the wilderness, "there was not one feeble [sick] person among their tribes" (Psalm cv. 37); and Solomon reminded the people that there had not failed one word of all the promises given through Moses (I Kings viii. 56).

In the fifth commandment we find the most explicit assurance of physical life, on the condition of obedience to parents. Passing on we read passages like the following, which cannot be disputed on any ground whatever: "O that there were such an heart in them, that they would fear me, and keep all my commandments always, that it might be well with them, and with their children forever" (Deuteronomy v. 29). "Ye shall walk in all the ways which the Lord your God hath commanded you, . . . that ye may prolong your days in the land which ye shall possess" (v. 33). "If thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I speak, . . . I will take sickness away from the midst of thee" (Exodus xxiii. 22, 25). "If ye hearken to these judgments, and keep and do them, . . . the Lord will take away from thee all sickness, and will put none of the evil diseases of Egypt, which thou knowest, upon thee; but

will lay them upon all them that hate thee" (Deuteronomy vii. 12, 15. See also Leviticus xxvi. 15, 16, and Deuteronomy xxviii. 58-62). Beyond all possible controversy, exemption from disease was held out to the Jew.

David's understanding of this and his testimony upon the subject are both very clear. He says, "The Lord is the strength of my life" (Psalm xxvii. 1). "O Lord my God, I cried unto thee, and thou hast healed me" (xxx. 2). "O Lord, thou hast brought up my soul from the grave; thou hast kept me alive, that I should not go down to the pit" (xxx. 3). Out of a great many other utterances of the King of Israel, read especially Psalms xli. 3; xci. 1-6; ciii. 2-5. When Solomon dedicated the temple he made a distinct request for healing in answer to prayer, and the Lord distinctly promised to hear (see II Chronicles viii. 13, 14). When David's child was sick, we read of a prophet, and not of a physician. Even the mighty sinner Jeroboam knew where to send when disease struck his child; and, later, the sternest rebuke and punishment were pronounced on Ahaziah because he forgot there was a God in Israel, and sent to inquire of Baalzebub.

There is no mistaking the lesson in the cases of Asa and Hezekiah. God had blessed and saved the former, but when "diseased in his feet . . . he sought not to the Lord, but to the physicians. And Asa slept with his fathers, and died" (II Chronicles xvi. 12, 13). Two hundred years after this, Hezekiah prayed and was miraculously healed; God's instrument being once more a prophet and not a physician; and, in answer to the King's prayer, the people were also healed. But when Hezekiah neglected to tell the messengers of the King of Babylon what a wonderful deliverance

God had sent him, the judgment o. heaven fell upon him also (II Chronicles xxxii. 31, and II Kings xx. 12).

In the days of Hezekiah, Isaiah the prophet lived and wrote. In the great atonement chapter we find the forecast of the coming Messiah expressed in the following literal readings: "A man of pains, and acquainted with sickness" (v. 3). "Surely our sicknesses he hath borne, and our pains he hath carried them" (4). "And by his bruise there is healing to us" (5). "And Jehovah hath delighted to bruise him; he hath made him sick" (10).

The above is Dr. Robert Young's translation, made, of course, without the faintest idea of assisting modern "faith-healers." Dr. Isaac Leeser gives a significant rendering of the fourth verse: "But only our diseases did he bear himself, and our pains he carried." Now, in view of the facts developed above, what sort of mind would it have required in a Jew to say that this chapter only referred to spiritual blessings? But we have a sure and certain commentator on this point.

In Matthew viii. 16, 17, we find the distinct declaration that Jesus "healed all that were sick, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses." Here the Holy Ghost, through Matthew, says Isaiah spoke of the body; but in I Peter ii. 24, we find the Spirit, speaking through that apostle, quoting these very words as applicable to the soul. The only inference must be that both are true, and that the atonement provided for both soul and body. *If Peter can be relied on for the present day, so can Matthew; and if Matthew's words have no present force and application, neither have Peter's.*

The Jew believes in a material kingdom; the Christian in a spiritual dominion. Both are right in what they receive, and wrong in what they reject. Jesus Christ did not abolish the decalogue and the moral law; the ceremonial alone passed away. We are not playing at see-saw with the Jew. Laws of health and healthy food are the same as they were in the days of Moses, and the best physicians are continually indorsing the sanitary and dietetic regulations of the great Hebrew leader.

Jesus Christ never turned away from those who sought healing at His hands. He specially commissioned the twelve to heal as well as to preach; and, later, the same commission was given to the seventy (Luke ix. 1–6 and x. 1–19). The only limit to these benefits was unbelief, as is plainly declared in Mark vi. 5 and Luke iv. 27. His last words, according to Mark, contain a positive promise of the "signs" which should "follow them that believe," among which we find the healing of the sick through the laying on of hands. This was not a promise to the apostles, but to "them that believe." The apostles took up the work of healing as an important part of the gospel. "Such as I have give I thee," said Peter at the beautiful gate of the temple. In those days a man who, like Stephen, was full of the Holy Ghost and of faith, almost of necessity did great signs and wonders among the people; and simple healings abounded everywhere. When the unbelievers raged against them, the apostles did not merely ask for more grace to bear it, but actually prayed for signs and wonders, in the name of Jesus (Acts iv. 30).

In Corinthians Paul speaks frequently of bodily matters, and specially mentions the several "gifts of the Spirit" which were

then in the church. Now "gifts of healing" stand on precisely the same ground with the others. The church does not discard the "word of wisdom" or the "word of knowledge," nor throw away "governments;" indeed, she is well-nigh governed to death in these days. But if one has lapsed, why not all? In Ephesians i. 14, Paul speaks of the "earnest of our inheritance." Part of this inheritance is to have our mortal bodies quickened by his Spirit (Romans viii. 11). "He that hath the Son hath life," and it is, therefore, concluded that "Christ within you, the hope of glory," must or may give an earnest, or a foretaste, for the body as well as for the soul. An impartation of the Divine life is looked for, enabling the man to perform any and all God-directed work until the day of his death, if he dies before the second advent.

Finally, we have the unanswerable direction to the sick in James v. 14, 15. "Is any sick among you? [among you believers] let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins [as a cause of the complaint] they shall be forgiven him." On this passage we remark that John Wesley quotes and indorses Bengel as saying that "this was the whole process of physic in the Christian church, till it was lost through unbelief." Dr. Daniel Steele says that the man who attempts to represent the word "sick" as having any other meaning than bodily ailment, is "either an ignoramus in Greek or an intentional deceiver;" and Dean Alford most forcibly declares that the whole passage refers to physical disorders and to these only.

As to the knowledge of medicine in the time of Christ, there is

abundant evidence to show that it was extensive and profound. Following Hippocrates (B. C. 460), who mentions no fewer than two hundred and sixty-five drugs, besides many dietary and surgical remedies, arose the schools of medicine under Herophilus, a profound anatomist, and Erasistratus, his rival. (Doctors disagreed in those days as well as at present.) After these came the Empiric school (280 B. C.), whose physicians were very successful, especially in surgery and the use of drugs; and later on Asclepiades, the friend of Cicero, founded a system known as "Methodism." The medical knowledge of the Roman Empire came from these men. This is sufficient to show that healing by faith was not instituted because of the ignorance of scientific methods.

One point needs to be especially guarded. Death is a consequence of sin, and is included in "the curse of the law." But "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law" (Galatians iii. 13), and a logical conclusion would lead us to expect translation, were it not for a number of special scriptures which expressly declare that this is not included at present (see Hebrews ix. 27, 28; Romans viii. 10–22; I Corinthians xv. 23–32; Colossians iii. 4; Hebrews ii. 8). These texts withhold the boon of translation from the direct covenant, and retain it in the special providence of God, except for the living, waiting saints at the second advent. They have its sure promise.

"Jesus Christ, the same, yesterday, to-day and forever," is a tremendous declaration. Now we have seen that the promises of God most undeniably contain the assurance of physical health, on condition of obedience. These promises have not been outlawed by time. We cannot throw them away without sacrificing the

decalogue and the moral law. An unbroken line of leaders, kings and prophets carry them down to the present gospel dispensation, and they are ours to-day. In II Corinthians i. 20, we read: "For all the promises of God in him are yea, and in him amen, unto the glory of God by us." These are included in the "all," therefore they are yea and amen in Christ, and therefore are based upon His vicarious atonement. The conditions to-day are the same as of old. *We must believe, and obey.* Belief is faith, and obedience is works. "Faith without works is dead;" so belief and simple obedience cannot be separated. When Naaman joined his obedience to his belief, and dipped in Jordan, faith and works were united, and salvation resulted. It is ever so.

THE PRACTICE.

1. "Faith-healers" believe in the use of means. The Scriptural means are always employed: —(1) Laying-on of hands, (2) anointing with oil, (3) the prayer of faith. They also believe in occasional leadings of the Spirit to employ other means, which may be inherently efficacious or not.

2. No one is advised by any prominent leader or teacher to lay aside all medicines, unless he can do so with perfect spontaneity. Forced abstinence is will power, not faith.

3. Faith in the patient is regarded as necessary when the individual is responsible. Even the man "borne of four" and let down through the roof had to obey the command to rise. Rare exceptions are known where the individuals have not been aware of the prayer offered in their behalf. These can be included under general answers to prayer. They are certainly conclusively against the supposition of any subjective condition of the patient.

4. A perfect consecration of the whole spirit, soul and body is strongly urged, It would be almost blasphemous to ask for healing with any other view than the entire devotement to God of the renewed powers. Hence the universal experience of spiritual blessings in those who seek to be healed.

5. Inquirers are instructed to believe that they do receive, when the Spirit witnesses within that their consecration and obedience are complete, and the prayer has been offered. "What things soever ye desire when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them," is the warrant for acting out the belief; that is, acting as if you were well. The leaders in this movement have themselves received life and health while following this same plan of action, and therefore give this advice with all knowledge and honesty.

6. The laying-on of hands, prayer and anointing are distinctly taught to be of no efficacy in themselves, any more than Jordan was to Naaman. But it is held that "to obey is better than sacrifice."

7. Those who fail to get saved and those who fail to be healed afford no argument against the continuance of preaching or praying. Lists of failures are not kept in either case; and the real reason lies in the fact presented in the very beginning of this article, that the doctrines of Christianity are not founded on phenomena, but upon the Word of God alone.

8. All who weigh the meaning of words counsel the use of such terms as will be mutually intelligible. A man who is exercising faith, but whose symptoms continue, is advised to say I believe, and not I feel.

9. It is taught that Satan can tempt to sickness, precisely as he can tempt to inward sin, by producing a symptom. He can consistently advise the use of a medicine to one who is striving to fix his faith upon God alone; especially when he thinks that the remedy will prove unavailing. In any case such action is more consistent in him than that of those good people who profess to believe that it is the will of God for them to suffer, and at the same time spend time and wealth for every conceivable medicine, in the attempt to defeat that will by getting well.

10. Finally, it is distinctly taught that Divine Healing, like every branch of salvation, is a matter of personal experience, and as such is not susceptible of perfectly logical explanation to the unbeliever. To him all such things are "foolishness," but "to us who believe" they become "the power of God." Every saved or healed man can testify from his heart: "One thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see," though he may utterly fail to convince the scribes and Pharisees.

True or false, there is no belief rising more swiftly before the churches everywhere than that of Divine Healing. There are over thirty "faith homes" in America to-day. In England and on the continent of Europe can be found a large number, some of them commodious institutions with a history of many decades of years. In June, 1885, an international conference on this subject assembled in London, composed of delegates from all parts of the world; and the great Agricultural Hall was taxed to its utmost to accommodate the serious crowds that flocked to hear. During the last two seasons a number of conventions have been held in New York, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Pittsburg, Detroit, and elsewhere, in

all of which Divine Healing has claimed an important part. The mass of evidence offered, the multitude of witnesses arising, and the words of Scripture on the subject demand at least a respectful hearing, and invite the closest scrutiny into the doctrine and practice of Divine Healing.

R. KELSO CARTER.

CHAPTER III.

Testing the Foundations.

IT cannot have escaped the notice of any careful reader of Faith-Healing literature that the chief foundation for the theory has always been laid with Old Testament materials. Such texts as Ex. xv. 26 and Deut. vii. 15, will be seen in glancing again over the argument just quoted, to be the real backbone of the belief. In saying this we do not neglect the fifty-third of Isaiah, but speak advisedly, for there is no doubt that without the very explicit promises just cited and the narrative of instances where God's healing power was so signally shown, as in the cases of Miriam, Hezekiah and others, the more or less figurative language of Isaiah would not form sufficient basis for any such radical theory as the one we are considering.

Just here we call attention to the fact that nearly all the critics who have argued against or sneered at Faith Healing have displayed a remarkable unanimity of disposition to avoid this Old Testament foundation alto-

gether. It has really appeared that they were afraid of it, and deemed it best and safest for their case not to refer to it at all. We think that the real reason for this ignoring of the numerous strong utterances of the Old Testament on the subject lies in the fact that they instinctively feared to bring them up lest they should not be able to set aside their force; hence the only safe way was to let them severely alone. It was for this, in past days, that the writer scored such opponents as Dr. Buckley of the *Christian Advocate*, asking why he, a minister of Jesus Christ and the Bible, should base all his arguments on "phenomena," and leave the Word of God, with all its voluminous sayings on the subject, entirely out of the matter. When Dr. Buckley studied the "Evidences of Christianity" he did not so learn the orthodox method of meeting an opponent who argued almost entirely from Scripture.

We cannot help thinking that the force of the very numerous passages in the Old Testament bearing upon healing was and is so overwhelming that no Christian minister relishes running up against them unless he is very, very clearly prepared to discuss them; and therefore, as he is not ready to accept their literal meaning in the premises, he dodges them altogether.

Certain it is that, as has been said, no one of all the writers against Faith Healing has ever taken up the matter from the beginning of the Scripture and followed it through to the end, as was done in D. H. Nearly all their powder was expended in shooting at "cases," and in showing that the power of the imagination has chiefly to do with cures. But, as this method of replying is really not replying at all, and as the Scriptures are and always have been the sole ground for the doctrine of Faith Healing as taught by its leading advocates, it becomes us, in attempting to show an element of mistake in that doctrine, to examine into the very basis of the argument upon its own ground. Nearly all sensible men can draw correct conclusions from a set of premises. If the latter be sound, of course the conclusion holds; but if the premises be defective, the whole argument falls to the ground. No matter how heavy and strong a door may be, if the hinge be pulled out the structure drops at once. It is therefore of the first importance to look to the hinges upon which the subject swings; for if the conclusion is really false, then it follows that there must be somewhere a faulty hinge which escaped the notice of the builder. A thousand times the writer has declared in

public and private, "If I have read the Scriptures correctly, THEN I KNOW the conclusion is sound — Jesus Christ has provided for physical health now and here, just as He has provided for soul healing; but if I have misread the Scriptures anywhere, I devoutly pray that it may be pointed out to me." Suffice it to say that such a misreading was pointed out, not by any writer against Faith Healing, but by the operation of the Holy Spirit through long experience, close study and much prayer. Let us now examine into the matter and test the foundations.

The Old Testament position seems to be that the Jew was promised healing and health if he kept the commandments, and warned of terrible diseases coming upon him if he transgressed. His history is punctuated with cases of healing by faith, and with instances of punishment by sickness. The distance between the Testaments is spanned by an arch, one end resting upon the fifty-third of Isaiah, the great "Atonement chapter," and the other finding its pier in Matt. viii. 17, "Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses."

Our study need not be a long one. That the Israelite was indeed promised health if he kept the commandments, is too plain to be denied for a moment. It

is there, over and over again; but even this statement requires careful examination and a testing to determine whether it, as the substructure, is able to bear the extreme weight afterwards put upon it.

Reading over all these old promises we see that they, without exception, hinge upon an "if." Everywhere it reads, "If ye will keep all my statutes." But again we notice that the strongest promise of all, that in Deut. vii., turns upon two conditions: first, their residing "in the land," the land of promise; and, second, the rigid keeping of all the statutes. Now be it remembered that those "statutes" contained a most admirable system of sanitary and dietary laws which have never been excelled for effectiveness. Food, clothing and methods of sanitation were specifically described and set in limits of scientific safety. Then the land itself was about the best in the inhabited earth, with features most perfectly adapted to drainage and all sanitary precautions, and at the same time possessed climatic conditions as near perfect as the earth has seen since the deluge.

Stop and consider these facts, and then answer whether there be any new gospel of health under such a *régime*. Given a splendid country with amply diversified surface, pure water, mild seasons, rich and

marvellously productive soil; a code of laws for food, clothing, sanitation and even personal bodily habits, which cannot be improved upon by the best modern science; then people this land with a race whose fathers had spent forty years in the physical training afforded by the dry, warm, healthy desert, living on a fare which in all that time only once or twice broke through the very quintessence of simple, pure, God-made diet; and then consider what epidemic or zymotic disease would have any chance of entering such a land and fastening upon such a people blessed with so matchless a heredity and guarded by such perfect law.

The fact is that the healthy results of such conditions and practices will bring forth exactly to-day the facsimiles of the days of Joshua. There is nothing, absolutely nothing to fear in admitting without reserve that the Israelite had positive health guaranteed him by God in the land of Canaan. It is true. He did. But it was "in the land," and "if he kept all the statutes." Who will dare to say that any people who will live in such a land, and follow carefully such matchless laws in every detail to-day, will not enjoy just as good health as the Israelites ever did? Find a people who for a genera-

tion or two have lived continuously in a dry, warm, fertile, hilly land, and have persevered in the strictest sanitary regulations, eaten proper amounts of perfectly healthy food, dressed in the best materials for their climate, faithfully rested, — not merely changed the style of their work from business worry to church and Sunday-school toil, — but actually rested in quietness one whole day in seven; who have not overworked or overworried, and have given plenty of time to sleep; who have never been rendered desperate by the prospect of their children having no possessions, or of immediate starvation, but who have been always permitted to glean freely behind the reapers and to share in the vintages, and have been cheered by the certainty of recovering any land they may have been forced to part with at the next jubilee; — find, we say, such a people as this, and you have one in the whole length and breadth of whose land hardly one physician could make a decent living, and among whom surgery, except for accidents, would be a lost art.

The people did not turn to Moses with his "all the learning of the Egyptians" for healing. Why should they, when Moses, at God's direction, instructed them so perfectly how to keep well? The gospel of health

in the land of Canaan was chiefly that contained in the proverb, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." All written in D. H. about God's keeping the Israelites well is true enough. He did keep them. But the METHOD He followed was to throw the practical responsibility upon them as reasoning beings, and to expect them to keep themselves by keeping His commandments. And doing this, of course, they needed no other physician. They had the best in the universe, and one who treated them, not as ignorant children, disguising His remedies in an unknown tongue, but took them straight into His confidence, explaining the whole method of preservation to them, and then telling them, "Do this, and thou shalt live."

We say, therefore, to the advocate of Faith Healing to-day: On what ground are you standing when you attempt to claim those Old Testament promises? Are you living in such a land as was Palestine in the days of Joshua? Are you dressing in strictly sanitary clothing? Are you eating only the most healthful food, or do you disregard Moses's bill of fare altogether and fill your stomach with those kinds of meat most likely to carry microbes into the system? Are you giving one seventh of your time to positive rest, or do you travel

daily on the lightning express train of hurry, hurry, hurry? What right have you to claim Ex. xv. 26 as your health-insurance policy, when you are most likely smashing one half of the required "statutes" all to bits every week you live?

Remember that those promises were given to the nation of Israel, not directly to the individual considered apart from the nation. True, the whole is composed of its parts, and the nation is made up of individuals; but do not be so foolish as to imagine that God intended always to miraculously preserve solitary persons in the midst of a general disregard for His laws. The whole history of God's dealings with His people disproves such an assumption. A faithful "seven thousand" did truly call out the saving power of Jehovah in the long run, but it did not prevent the prevalence of famine and trouble in the whole land.* God specially took care of Elijah, but no general theory can be founded on that; quite the reverse. It points clearly to the theory of special providences at the supreme will of the Lord.

In revising D. H. in 1884 the force of these condi-

* So to-day the individual Christian, no matter how holy, living in malarious Africa, and more or less neglectful of the best rules of health, generally succumbs to the fever in a short time, unless blessed with an unusually fine heredity.

tions was seen to a considerable extent, and the following language was used, D. H., page 182:

"The conditions laid down for our observance are very particular and absolutely rigid. These conditions have been overlooked by the majority in their eagerness to obtain the gift. It is ever so. We are all apt to jump over the intervening objects in order to reach our aim, and all too frequently we thus leave dangerous foes in the rear, and ourselves unprotected from their assault. In revising this book I find the conditions all there, and clearly stated, but not emphasized as they should be in order to guard against the weakness referred to. I therefore warn every reader to pay special attention to the conditions attached to the promises quoted from Scripture."

Again, on page 55, we read in italics, "If the church would obey the injunction of verse 31, 'Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all for the glory of God,' and obey it in the last and least particular, the doctors would have to look to the world for support."

What right have we to take a promise from the Bible and throw away the attached conditions? Perhaps some poorly informed mind will reply that we are not

now "under the law, but under grace." Then, if you disclaim the condition because it was ordered under the law, what possible business have you with the promise, which was most distinctly given under the same law? Remember that the real "laws of health" are the same that they were three thousand years ago. There has been no change. There could not be, for these laws are the expression of the facts of nature about us; they are dependent absolutely upon our environment. Go into the miasmatic Nile valley to-day and live in the midst of decaying vegetable matter, and you will likely soon know by experience what Moses was talking about when he spoke of "fevers" and "the burning ague." But take up your residence in the "mountains of Israel," and you will be cured of your ague more effectually than by quinine. A mere observance of the frequent ablutions directed by Moses will do wonders of healing in many cases. "Wash and be clean" is sound advice to multitudes of the diseased in all parts of the world.

Before making too lofty a mountain of the promise in Ex. xv., it is well to remember the dense ignorance of the people to whom it was given. Who among modern advocates of Faith Healing have stopped to

picture the physical condition of the vast horde of slaves that emerged from the horrible bondage of Egypt under the guidance of the great lawgiver? Read the best literature on the subject and try to imagine the inexpressible horrors of that oppression under the Pharaohs who "knew not Joseph." Think of the nation of Israel dwelling in filthy hovels built of Nile mud and straw, standing in the reeking soil by the river, in long unshaded rows, with no possible drainage, no decent provision for the removal of offal and refuse, no time for bathing, no money to purchase change of raiment, no hours of rest beyond the few of the night's cessation from awful toil, no medical attention from the many specialists of Egypt, no proper food from childhood up, in fact nothing which they needed for health and preservation; living under a cloud of despair, and dying like sheep in a storm, without alleviation of their misery, and without hope for their posterity. Truly the fact of their increase under such trials is in itself a miracle second to none in the whole marvellous list; and the other fact that when they went into the wilderness, as the Psalmist says, "There was not one feeble person in all their tribes" (Ps. cv. 37), demonstrates another miracle of a like nature.

With all this in view we are better able to see the reason for such "laws of health" as those formulated through Moses. The people needed direction about every detail. They knew nothing, simply nothing. They needed instruction in the very elements, and received it with attendant promises and warnings to stimulate them to observe the new regulations. Any missionary who has struggled for years with a pack of dirt-loving savages, in the endeavor to teach them habits of systematic cleanliness, will no doubt feel a sympathy with Moses as he formulated the new laws of the Exodus, and appreciate better than most men the force of the proverb which declares that that virtue is "next to godliness."

We must not read into the promises of the Old Testament a sense which did not exist either in the minds of the writers or the hearers. THERE WAS NO DIRECT MIRACLE EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED IN EX. XV. OR DEUT. VII., nor do they afford any ground for the extreme position taken by D. H. and other writings that the Atonement has provided exemption from sickness if we only meet all conditions, that is, obey fully the Spirit of God. THOSE PROMISES STAND TO-DAY FOR ALL THAT THEY WERE WORTH TO ISRAEL IN THE LAND,

BUT THEY CERTAINLY DO NOT STAND FOR ANY MORE. And how much they then stood for, we have now fully seen. We do not propose to give them up. God forbid. Would that more could be persuaded to really claim them, or rather put themselves in the position to claim them, by carefully keeping the statutes contained in the health law. We do not relinquish the moral law. Of course not. It has not lost an ounce of weight from age. It depends on principles grounded deep in the nature of things as made by God. But the same is true of the laws of health, and we can as easily set aside the one as the other.

OLD TESTAMENT CASES OF HEALING.

The cases of healing recorded in Scripture are of the greatest importance, for they may be considered as commentaries and illustrations. No time will be wasted in discussing their genuineness (except by infidels in general, either out of or in the nominal church), and therefore they must be understood as setting forth in a parable the mind and purpose of God. It is with great interest that we carefully read over the accounts of the sickness and healing of Abimelech's household (Gen. xx. 17), Rebekah's barrenness (Gen. xxv. 21), Miriam's

leprosy (Num. xii. 13), Job's boils (Job ii. 7), Hannah's prayer for a son (I Samuel ii.), the Shunamite's son and the poisoned dish of herbs (II Kings iv.), Naaman's leprosy (II Kings v.), Hezekiah's illness (II Kings xx.), the case of Asa (II Chron. xvi.): these with the unhealed blindness of Isaac, of Jacob, of Eli and of Samson, and the obsession of King Saul and the senile weakness of David in his last days, constitute about all to be considered. A few more like the sickness of King Ahaziah and of Jeroboam's child, besides the child of David and Bathsheba, serve as shadows to the picture, and aid in bringing out the healings in bold relief.

After a candid examination of these cases, who can fail to conclude (from them alone) that healing by the direct power of God was a special favor, sent often in answer to believing prayer, but absolutely at the supreme will of Jehovah? The good Isaac — a special type of Christ as the Prince of Peace — prayed for some twenty years before the Lord healed Rebekah. In this case, however, the healing was granted. It is impossible to suppose that Isaac and his wife did not pray that his failing sight should be restored by the same all-powerful hand; yet the fact remains that the

good old man lived, after the episode of the birthright sale and the blessing on his sons, for over forty years. His son Jacob had a somewhat similar experience, and though he was so near God that his "blessing prevailed above the blessings of his progenitors unto the utmost bounds of the everlasting hills" (Gen. xlix. 26), yet he also was blind and unable to see the difference between Ephraim and Manasseh. God guided his hands by inspiration, but did not see fit to heal his blindness.

The very manner in which Moses is referred to at his death shows most conclusively that such preservation of sight and strength was phenomenal and special. He had given the law, and was truly a wonderful example of the possibility of keeping it; yet there is no suggestion of a RIGHT in the matter of his remarkable vigor, but rather the noting of it as extraordinary, just as in the case of Caleb. No one would ever think of these two cases as anything but exceptions to the rule, if they were simply studied apart from any theory. Much the same may be said of the blindness of Eli. He was able to interpret the word of the Lord, but he was not healed of his infirmity.

The case of Samson is noteworthy. He was a young man, dying at about forty years of age. He did not

lose his sight on account of ill health, but by mechanical means in the hands of the enemies of his people. The "Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him" again; and even after his last yielding to Delilah and his punishment in the prison of the Philistines, his prayer brought down once more the power of God, and he did more in his death than in all his life. Yet we do not read of any prayer for his sight, and certainly he died blind. "Deserved it?" says some one. Ah! which of us deserves healing or any other mercy from God? It is not wise to assume the judicial ermine in such cases. That belongs to the Lord alone.

King David, the "man after God's own heart," has furnished believers in Faith Healing with more texts than any other single writer in the Old Testament; such as: "The Lord is the strength of my life" (Ps. xxvii. 1); "For with thee is the fountain of life" (xxxvi. 9); "Unto God the Lord belong the issues from death" (lxviii. 20); all of Ps. xci. and much of ciii. and cvii. are very sheet anchors in the argument. But while it was true that David declared upon one occasion, "O Lord my God, I cried unto thee, and thou hast healed me" (xxx. 2), yet it is also true that the answer was sometimes withheld; and in his old age he was afflicted

with anæmia and general debility, for which no cure was found.

Job, the "perfect man," evidently considered himself entitled to health, wealth and prosperity because of "the integrity of his hands;" which belief was also strongly held by his friends, as proved by their berating him and accusing him of sin as a reason for his misfortunes. But the record of inspiration goes behind the scenes and reveals the positive permission of God to the powers of evil to afflict His servant. Without at present discussing the merits of the case, it is clear that the impression one would receive from an unprejudiced reading of the story is that God deals with men as He pleases, and that health or sickness, while generally depending on the keeping of the laws of health, are specially in the hands of the Lord. In other words, God may heal in answer to prayer and He may not.

But what a difference is apparent when we study the Old Testament on the SIN QUESTION! From Genesis to Malachi not one case can be found of a man who prayed diligently for soul healing in vain. Not a case can be produced in which God inflicted sin on a man either directly or permissively. This alone ought to stagger any one who attempts to claim the very same

deliverance from sickness as from sin. Even in the case of such mighty sinners as Ahab himself God forgave instantly when there was any repentance and prayer, until Elijah was astonished and actually disgusted at the mercy of the Lord. To the very end, even when the mission of the lying spirit had been foretold as a success, Jehovah sent Ahab the truth through Micaiah, and gave him abundant warning and opportunity for repentance. No man was ever turned away who sought in honesty of purpose for forgiveness. There never was a single exception. Soul healing, conditioned upon repentance and faith, was universal; but bodily healing was not always granted, as we have just seen.

THE PRAYERS OF OLD TESTAMENT SAINTS.

In direct connection with the cases mentioned in the Old Testament, it is well to study the prayers offered for healing. Moses prayed for Miriam, Abraham for Abimelech, Isaac for Rebekah, Solomon for his people, Elisha for the Shunamite's son, Hezekiah for himself and for the people; besides the miracle cases like that of Naaman, in which we do not read of any special prayer. The language used by all as recorded never suggests the thought of a consciousness of any right in

the matter, nor of any general belief that healing was certainly for anyone and everyone. On the contrary, such expressions as "heal her now, I beseech thee," and "Isaac besought the Lord," and "Hezekiah prayed and wept sore," all convey the idea that God was asked for a special favor; and the manner of recording the answer points plainly to the same conclusion. Of course such a case as Naaman's stands upon another ground, — that of the peculiar guidance of a specially-inspired prophet, — but at the same time this proves the same thing, — a special favor granted in the sovereign will of Jehovah. No other conclusion could be reached by an impartial examiner studying the question simply upon its merits, with no theory to support. We are therefore ready to state briefly and clearly what was the

OLD TESTAMENT POSITION.

Beyond further controversy it was emphatically one of LAW. The whole spirit of the Pentateuch is a spirit of law. The entire dispensation from Moses to Christ was a dispensation of law. But in admitting this let it be remembered that God gave, through Moses, two general kinds of laws, constitutional and statutory. The first are founded in the very nature of things, and are

essentially as immutable as that nature. The second were ordered for and during a certain time, to guide and control matters of detail which had no inherent moral or physical principles involved. It is easy to see that the Ten Commandments — the essence of the "moral law" — rest not merely upon the official order of Jehovah, but rather upon and in His very nature. They take hold upon the constitution of the world and of God's government in the world, and hence they have never lost an atom of their force. They cannot lose it while God and His universe are as they are. On the other hand, the statutes concerning the tabernacle and temple worship — the "ceremonial law" — being typical foreshadowings of the coming Sacrifice upon Calvary, and having been fulfilled there in the person and Atonement of Christ, at once lost their force and fell into disuse.

The "law of health" given by Moses comes regularly under the first class cited, that of "constitutional law," for it depends not on the whim of the lawgiver, but upon the very nature of things. While the world is as it is, order, rest, temperance, good food, proper clothing, pure water, sanitation and correct habits will and must result in health. Their continuous observance

is itself the "law of health," and largely the law of healing. Hence it is plain that Ex. xv. 26 and Deut. vii. 15, with their contexts, are not a statement of God's intention to work miracles for the preservation of His people's health, but rather His giving them the INFORMATION HOW TO KEEP WELL.

Instead of these texts being a proper foundation for a full theory of a present and universal "atonement for sickness," they are really a statement of "natural law." (All truly "natural law" is God's law, of course.) The declaration "I am the Lord that healeth thee" ought to be read as meaning, I am the Lord who has made a set of principles and conditions, which things I am going to tell you in order that you may, by strictly observing them, avoid the coming of the diseases which cursed Egypt. If you will keep these natural laws and principles to be given through Moses, you will have health. If you refuse to do so, you shall experience all that must follow, as you have seen in Egypt. "Healeth thee," how? Not by miracle (except in the special will of the Lord), but by law and its strict observance.

Instead therefore of a promise of a mysterious, direct, unknown divine power, neutralizing natural cause

and effect, setting aside all consequences of broken law, the Old Testament position in this matter of health is a most emphatic declaration of the NECESSITY for natural law and for the SYSTEMATIC OBSERVANCE of the same.

Finally, when some one thoughtlessly asks, "But was not all that was promised given because of the Atonement?" we reply: Of course it was. Everything God has given fallen man is based on the Atonement. All the health and all the salvation and all the life here or hereafter which man has enjoyed or will enjoy since Eden swung to its gates behind our first parents, is founded in that mighty and wondrous mystery, the Atonement of the Son of God. But, beloved, do not forget that the receipt of the benefits of the Atonement on our part is subject to the divine arrangement of times and seasons and dispensations. We do not get everything at once. "Every man in his own order." Heaven, the life eternal, the resurrection, the coming ages of blessing and peace, the New Jerusalem, the many mansions, — all these and more will be ours through the Atonement. We must not anticipate the plan of God The court of heaven will pay us everything in our Father's will to the last item; but it will be in the order and time set by that court. If we attempt to

discount God's notes before the time set in the conditions, we need not be surprised to find those notes APPARENTLY going to protest. And do not forget that because some of us grow alarmed at this, and become as we think "very jealous for the Lord," there is not the slightest danger that God will attempt to defend His credit. As in the days of David, the ark has no need of support. It can still stand alone. And it will be well to remember that trying to hold it up once proved dangerous.

CHAPTER IV.

The New Testament Position.

THE Scriptures we have examined in the preceding chapters cover the whole ground of Old Testament teaching on the subject. The great "Atonement chapter," the fifty-third of Isaiah, was purposely not considered, because its interpretation by the advocates of Faith Healing depends wholly upon New Testament utterances; hence we have properly reserved it until now. There is no doubt whatever that the vast scheme of the Atonement was very little in the horizon of Old Testament vision. God had not revealed it fully. It was "the mystery" of which Paul writes, which had not been opened to the saints of old. They had been granted shadowy hints only of the coming glory of the cross. Hence it is evident that Isaiah fifty-third was not depended upon for healing by the people of that day and generation. As we have seen, their promises were promises of law.

As we open the New Testament we are struck with the evident prominence given to miracles of healing.

At the very outset Jesus impressed His touch of power upon the bodies of the people, and we certainly get no hint of a single case being turned away. It would be entirely gratuitous to assume that any man ever reached the side of Jesus, made a plea for healing and was denied. "He healed all that were sick" is the repeated declaration of the Word.

Just here the thoughtful mind is struck with a tremendous contrast. Jesus is certainly in the world today; He is with us "unto the end of the age." The Holy Spirit, whom he sent, showed the same healing power after Pentecost that Christ had displayed before, and vast multitudes were healed. Again, we never read of one who actually asked for healing being denied by the apostles. But if this is the same dispensation, why such a startling difference? Now multitudes ask, pray, beseech; but few are healed. Thank God, SOME ARE HEALED BY THE DIRECT POWER OF GOD IN THIS DAY OF GRACE.* The Christian who holds differently must throw away all our thousands of recorded "answers to prayer," or a great part of them. No; we believe that God is still a "prayer-hearing and prayer-

* See the Appendix.

answering God;" but nevertheless the great, the very great majority of those who now seek healing by faith do not receive the literal answer. They are not healed. From the fullest possible acquaintance with the general results of all the prominent meetings for healing the sick held in the last twenty years, with the very best statistics at hand, and a very wide familiarity with after results in cases of claimed healing, we frankly state it to be our conviction that only a small per cent of the seekers after health are *really and positively cured.* In saying this we know that some enthusiastic teachers have at times made extravagant claims: one in particular asserting to the writer that out of thousands prayed with fully "ninety per cent were healed." We are compelled to relate, however, that the best accounts from good friends of this teacher, and the closest watching of his work for years, have forced the belief that such a claim was altogether imaginative. We will not press this further, as this little book is not written to attack any man, but merely to point out error and uphold truth. Nothing ever was gained by "claiming too much." Such a course always damages the best of causes almost more than anything else. We want the truth, and nothing but the truth.

Facing, therefore, at the very outset of our New Testament study, this terrible lack of correspondence between then and now, we ask, Does not this alone speak strongly of a special dispensation in the sovereign will of God? The answer that the church has so "fallen away" simply will not do. There are many and grievous backslidings and errors in the church. No doubt of it. But so there were in the days of Elijah. Poor man! he thought he stood actually alone. Yet when were there more wonderful miracles performed since the Exodus through any mere man? The fact of the matter is, the miracles of the Bible cluster largely about important epochs when God was desirous of starting some marked advance in the line of His plans, or of bringing about a great revival of pure religion. And as the coming of Christ marked the greatest advance and the greatest revival, we find the stream of miracles widened out to its largest limits since man's history began. We must not forget, however, that another "epoch" may occur again whenever God wills.

All this being true, we are prepared to inquire whether any new law of health was formulated by Jesus. He gave a new law of spiritual life, the law of

love instead of the law of fear; the law of "may" and "can" instead of the law of "must." He abolished penalties in many cases, and closed up forever the whole ceremonial law. It is therefore a most pertinent question, Did Christ clearly express any new moral law or any new health law? He changed the statutory regulations, but did He attempt to alter the constitutional enactments?

The answer must be, He did not. No new moral code was given. True, He removed the death penalty in the case of adultery, and indicated a change in many other cases; but this was not a change in the moral law itself. He did not alter the nature of the offences in any of these cases. Not one item in the Ten Commandments was touched. Taking hold on the principles and nature of things, these were simply enforced, Christ only giving a better and easier method for keeping them by the principle of a changed heart, which Moses had prophesied, Deut. xxx. 6.

And so Jesus did not say a word about any new law of health. He declared He came to "fulfil the law," not to destroy it. How, therefore, could He change portions of that law which, as we have seen, were grounded in the eternal principles of God? He did not

make it healthy to live in African jungles, as our best missionaries too well know to-day. *That work is reserved for His next appearing. The physical world will be changed then, not before. During this dispensation the kingdom of God is "within you." In the next great age it will be set up without, in physical things, and the world will be another Eden.*

Let us now take up the attempt to found a new theory and doctrine based upon Matt. viii. 16, 17. "He healed all that were sick: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses." In this connection read again the brief summary of the different translations of Isaiah fifty-third already given in the *Century* article (page 29). From these it will be seen that the claim for a physical reference is put forward as of equal strength with the reference to sin, and the most important argument certainly is that contained in the words, "In Matt. viii. 16 we find a commentary, written by the Holy Spirit, which cannot possibly be explained away. . . . Here, then, the Holy Ghost informs us that the words of Isaiah did refer to the body. But the apostle Peter also quotes these same words for the soul, when he says: 'Who his

own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree. Let him who can, disprove the following: If Peter can be relied on for the present day and generation, so can Matthew. And if Matthew's quotation has no force to-day, then neither has Peter's."

Again, on page 45, we read, "If the Atonement for sickness is not found in this chapter, then the Atonement for sin cannot be found in it."

And this: "Albert Barnes did not seek to prove Faith Healing when he said, 'In the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah is fully stated the doctrine of the Atonement.'"

"Now why did He thus bear our sicknesses? Was it for His own chastisement, reproof or correction? Did He need to bear the load of disease any more than the load of sin? Then why did He do it? We have the fact that He did bear both. Why was it? Every one must admit that I Peter ii. 24 and Matt. viii. 17 are equally plain and positive, and the candid mind must be struck with the close analogy between them. But Peter gives the reason of the sin-bearing — 'that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness;' that is, that we, being free from the necessity as well as the guilt of sin, should live in soul health. Is it stepping too far beyond the rules of analogy to say that

Jesus bore our sicknesses that we, being dead to disease, should live unto bodily health? Be cool and deliberate, and let your logic come to the front. Does not Matthew say as much? He tells us that Jesus 'healed all who were sick' in order to fulfil the Scripture which of all others plainly speaks of the Atonement. Paul says, in Eph. v. 23, 'he is the saviour of the body,' and we all believe that the complete fulness of salvation will never be realized until that wonderful day when the reunited soul and body shall be glorified with Him at His appearing."

Well, we will "let our logic come to the front" after the long time of thirteen years, during which much "cool" reflection has been enjoyed. The answer to all this is very simple. On the face of it, the statements about Peter and Matthew being equally reliable are perfectly true. Of course they are. One is as much inspired as the other. He is foolish indeed who attempts to find refuge in a vague brushing aside of the words of the Holy Spirit. If they cannot be explained, it is because we do not understand them, not because of any flaw in them. We are as erring as the Word is "inerrant." But when we do get the light from the right source, then all is perfectly harmonious,

The whole trouble with all the above argument from D. H. is that it loses sight of God's times and seasons and dispensations in the effort to secure at once all the provisions of the "will." Jesus surely did bear our diseases just as He bore our sins. So did He bear our "sorrows." So did He bear our "temptations," being "in all points tempted like as we are." And some day God intends that the full, complete benefits of all this "bearing" shall be enjoyed by us. What Christian dare say nay to this? But what Christian will dare to claim all these benefits now and here in this present world?

Jesus bore our temptations, but we are told plainly enough that we must still be tempted in this state of probation. And we are cautioned not to think it strange when we are in distress through "manifold temptations."

Jesus Christ bore our "sorrows," for He was "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief;" but do we pretend that therefore we are delivered from all sorrow in this world? We are given ample grace by which to endure our sorrows, but there is no present promise of exemption. On the other hand we are told that all sorts of sorrows and trials will come upon us in this

life; we are warned of persecutions, traitorous defections, betrayals, disappointments, loss of friends, miscarriage of our plans; in fact the very scheme of the Christian life involves sorrow because of its antagonism to all things and persons worldly and of the world.

Again, Jesus Christ bore our death. He died for us, that we may live for Him. But we do not yet receive this great boon. Freedom from death has not yet reached us. We are delivered "from the fear of death," and the "sting of death" is destroyed; but the Conqueror of death has not yet "put all things under him." Potentially He has done so; but actually the time has not become "full." The dying Christian does not "see death;" he sees the Lord who has bought him with His own blood. But he dies, nevertheless. Just so the fully saved Christian does not see his sorrows and trials; he looks through and over them to the Lord, who is "the strength of his life," and sees the victory in the name of the King.

A little reflection will surely convince any one that we need to most carefully examine the evidence of Scripture and the evidence of experience before we undertake to grasp at present any one of the fruits of the Atonement. Read what is written, and what "is

written again," and then form solid conclusions. There is no more ground to claim that because "Jesus bore our sicknesses," therefore we do not ever have to be sick, than there is to conclude that because Jesus "bore our sorrows," therefore we never need suffer grief, unless we can produce specific Scriptures which teach this special point. The fact that Christ "healed all that were sick" in the days of His early ministry, and the fact that this was done to fulfil prophecy, neither of these, nor both together, prove the claim unless more can be produced. For is it not plain the very same can be said of sorrow, trial, and even death itself? Yet we must and do suffer all these in this dispensation, no matter how lofty may be our spiritual experience.

In due order, therefore, we come to the inquiry, Did Christ distinctly set up the doctrine of a full Atonement-ground for present exemption from sickness? Remember, He knew the law; and He came to "fulfil the law." He knew that the Old Testament basis for health was simply obedience to law. Yet He never hinted at a change in those laws of health, while He did enunciate new laws in the spiritual realm. CERTAINLY IT IS MOST REASONABLE TO CLAIM THAT IF JESUS INTENDED TO ALTER THE BASIS OF PHYSICAL

HEALTH FROM THE STRICT OBSERVANCE OF HIS OWN "NATURAL LAWS" TO A PURE FAITH IN HIS WORK OF ATONEMENT, HE MUST HAVE PLAINLY DECLARED THIS CHANGE.

Is it not true that Christ lifted the life for the soul from its legal basis of "Do this, and thou shalt live"? And did He not distinctly place it upon the new basis of "faith"? Did He not over and over state the new belief to be founded in Him alone? "He that believeth in me." "Come unto me, and I will give you rest." "He that eateth me, even he shall live by me." "He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life." How plain these Scriptures are! There could be no mistake. Christ was ushering in a new order in the ages, the order of "faith" as distinct from the "works of the law." Hence we expect to find, and in spiritual matters we do find, abundant reference to and declaration of this great change of base. But in physical matters was there not as much need for plainness? The physical, like the spiritual, had stood for fifteen centuries on a basis of law and obedience. If it was to be changed to a faith basis, surely there was call for a plain declaration on the part of the Founder of the new order of things. What could be more evident than this?

But where do we find such a declaration? Search all through the recorded utterances of Christ, but you will search in vain. He never made any such a declaration. He said He "came to seek and save that which was lost," but He did not say He came to heal and exempt from sickness. He did heal; ah yes, He healed all manner of sickness among the people, but he never gave a positive insurance policy to any one. On the contrary, his warning, "Go and sin no more, lest a worse thing come upon thee," hints strongly at a continued obedience to that law which the man had formerly broken. There is no suggestion of a change of base as to health. And Christ over and over declared the main purpose of His "works" to be to prove to the densely clouded minds of His hearers His divine origin and mission.

He commissioned His disciples to heal saying, "Behold I give you power to heal and to cast out devils: freely ye have received, freely give." To the seventy He said, "And as ye go, heal the sick." Does not a close study of these words suggest the thought that while the preaching of "the gospel of the kingdom" was their main business, the healing was an accompaniment, as a blessing and a testimony? But this at once

settles the question, and shows that the healing was not an integral part of the new faith; it was incidental, in the will of the Lord, and for a special purpose.

"*As* ye go, heal." The very words indicate the healing to be a subordinate matter to the "going" and the "saying." If this is not plain enough, look at the words announcing the mission of Christ: "Jesus went about preaching the gospel of the kingdom and healing the sick." Who that has the least grammatical information cannot see that the word "and" clearly places the healing not within "the gospel of the kingdom," but as a special adjunct of the missionary effort? If the healing had been a vital part of the Atonement for present acceptance, is it not as clear as the sun in the heavens that Jesus would have said, "Preach the gospel of the kingdom, preach (or teach) the gospel of health"? But He said "preach the gospel, and (while doing that) heal the sick; for behold I have given you power here and now to do so." He did not say He had given them power to preach, but He did say He gave them power to heal. The only assignable reason for this lies in the fact that the preaching or teaching of the gospel was for all and free to all, while the "power to heal" was always as He saw fit to give it.

A business man says to his trusted agent about to start on a mission of special importance, "Explain to every firm the whole plan of this new business, and as you visit them, give them a handsome dinner." Who would dream of placing the dinner as an integral part of the business plan? The very language employed clearly distinguishes between them. One is the matter of importance, the other an incidental present. So precisely Jesus sent His disciples to preach the gospel of salvation, and while they were doing that He chose to give them a fund of power to heal, as an evidence of His divinity and an example of His mighty mercy.

In Luke iv. 18, 19, Jesus read from Isaiah lxi. 1, as His official announcement of the nature of His mission. "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison doors to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord —" Here he stopped, for "the day of the vengeance of our God" had not and has not yet arrived. In this declaration of His purpose there is no plain setting forth of the doctrine of either salvation or healing. The language is so figurative

that it might be made to cover all sorts and kinds of trouble if it were not for the exposition afforded by Christ's other words and by His acts. Reading it in the light of these, we see that He came to give immediate and positive spiritual salvation through simple faith in Him. To this all His words and acts testify. And we see that He did heal all who came to Him for healing, but that He did not preach about and teach this healing doctrinally as He did the salvation. Hence the conclusion is irresistible that the two were not meant to be placed on any equality, and that Jesus never, by word or deed, conveyed any such idea.

Such language as that of Matt. ix. 35 is very plain as to the relative place occupied by the healing ministry of our Lord. "Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing every sickness and every disease among the people." Again we say that if the healing were an integral part of the "gospel," it would not be so mentioned as an ADDITIONAL matter. Jesus healed always as an act of mercy, and never spoke of it in any other way. He did indeed "preach good tidings to the meek," and in a peculiar sense He "bound up the broken-hearted." He "proclaimed

liberty to the captives," and brought the glad news of "the opening of the prison doors to those who were bound." But every word of this is perfectly applicable to the captives of sin, to those bound in iniquity. There is no specific foundation here for the theory and doctrine of Faith Healing in the Atonement. And when we look to the teaching and the practice of Jesus for an interpretation of the words of the prophet, we find the spiritual work given as the real work, and the healings added as acts of mercy, and appealed to as credentials of His divinity.

Just here we will refer to a text very much relied on by advocates of Faith Healing in the Atonement. Mark xvi. 17, "And these signs shall follow them that believe; in my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." Notice that this follows the careful direction to "Go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." How is it possible to read these words and not see the immense difference between the matter of spiritual salvation and

healing? The "gospel" is for "every creature," conditioned sharply on his personal exercise of faith. But the healing is classed with immunity against serpents and poison, which we simply know was not general and for every one, but was a special manifestation of the power of God. And lest there should be any possible mistake about the matter the very word "signs" is plainly used. Here we find Christ, in His latest utterance, according to Mark, giving the distinction between the gospel of salvation and the "signs" of healing. What more can be asked by any sensible mind?

There is no need to attempt to break the force of these words of Mark by claiming that they do not belong in the record, as many do. Too many believe them to be genuine, and Prof. Rendell Harris's remarkable "measurements" of the text seem to prove that they belong in it. But nothing can be stronger against the claim that the Atonement was designed to give present health to all through faith than these very verses; for in them Christ Himself puts salvation on the ground of personal faith, but places healings in the list of "signs" following to indorse that gospel in the popular mind. As we know from the record in Acts and the Epistles that healings did not always follow every-

where, at all times, we see beyond further controversy that Jesus did not intend to teach such a doctrine.

There is nothing in the New Testament bearing upon the doctrine which does not come regularly under what we have already considered. We may therefore spare further discussion, stopping merely to show in one or two notable instances that all may be explained with equal readiness. We have already quoted somewhat from D. H. on Gal. iii. 13: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree."

On pages 19 and 20 we quoted two syllogisms showing that sickness was as much in the "curse," and even more so than sin. Without further extracts, we will call attention to the great fact that the very first and fundamental "curse of the law" was that of death. "Ye shall surely die" was and is the quintessence of the "curse." If we turn again to Moses in Deut. vii. and elsewhere, we find him telling how the people should be consumed with fevers and agues, and how they should die, if they broke the law of Sinai. Sickness is only incipient death. All our physical ailments lead up and point to death. He who cannot die cannot be sick.

There is no dispute there. Hence we see that Gal. iii. 13 may just as well be urged for present freedom from death as from sickness. So may it be urged for freedom from sorrow, grief, trial, suffering of any and all kinds, for all come because of broken law and the power of sin and death in the world.

If some one answer that there is a special provision made for death in such Scriptures as "It is appointed unto man once to die," coupled with the evident apostolic expectation of death unless Jesus should first appear, it is sufficient to read carefully the eighth chapter of Romans, from the eighth to the twenty-sixth. Here Paul plainly declares that our bodies are still under disabilities; that certain infirmities are possible and probable; that these are sufficient to cause great aversion on our part, and to produce earnest longing after deliverance; but that we must "hope" and "wait" till the time arrives for "the redemption of the body." Thank God, we "shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption," but the time is not yet. It belongs to the coming age. So we see that we do have special Scripture warning us not to attempt to grasp all the fruits of the Atonement for the body till the proper time has come. The "will" provides for the gift, but

the court is not ready to pay it just now. This is the specific theme of the verses in Rom. viii., and a careful reading will amply repay any troubled mind.

One other passage or point needs attention. Rev. A. B. Simpson has long been accustomed to lay special stress on "the earnest of our inheritance," arguing that to be complete it must bear upon the body. He then reasons that while it is true we continue to fade and die, yet we may receive an impartation of Christ's risen life in our bodies, lifting us above all disease and giving us strength above the natural. In reply to this it is simply necessary to take the plain declaration of the apostle. He says distinctly that this "earnest of our inheritance" was and is the Pentecostal sealing with the Holy Spirit. Writing to the Ephesians, nine years after the events recorded in the nineteenth chapter of Acts, he says, "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, WHICH IS THE EARNEST OF OUR INHERITANCE UNTIL the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory." (See also Rom. viii. 23; II Cor. v. 5, i. 22.)

What could be plainer? The matter of their

"salvation" was settled. But after that they had been "sealed by the Spirit," as recorded in Acts, and that spiritual "sealing" Paul positively states to be all there is of the "earnest" until the next age is ushered in.

CHAPTER V.

St. James on Healing by Faith.

THE special direction to the sick contained in the fifth chapter of James is of sufficient importance to claim the fullest examination. The extreme plainness and simplicity of the language place these words beyond the pale of criticism or objection, except on the part of peculiarly narrow minds. Such sincere hearts and ample brains as those possessed by the great Bengel, the marvellously gifted John Wesley, the splendid scholar Dean Alford, and the clear-headed Dr. Daniel Steele, besides many others of note, see in the words of James v. 14–16 just what they appear to say to any ordinary unprejudiced mind. The paraphrase of Dean Alford is instructive. He says, "Shall save . . . here, considering that the forgiveness of sin is afterwards stated separately, SOSEI, can only be used of corporeal healing, not of the salvation of the soul. . . . The anointing was not a mere human medium of cure, but had a sacramental character. (The same words

are used of baptism, Matt. xxviii. 19; Acts ii. 38, x. 48, xix. 5). . . . The apostle is enforcing the efficacy of prayer in afflictions, verse thirteen. Of such efficacy he adduces one special instance. In sickness, let the sick man inform the elders of the church. Let them, representing the congregation of the faithful, pray over the sick man, accompanying that prayer with the symbolic and sacramental act of anointing with oil in the name of the Lord. Then the prayer of faith shall save (heal) the sick man, and the Lord shall bring him up out of his sickness; and even if it were occasioned by some sin, that sin shall be forgiven him. Such is the simple and undeniable sense of the apostle, arguing for the efficacy of prayer. . . . Observe the promises here made of recovery and forgiveness are unconditional, as in Mark xvi. 18. . . . And pray for one another that ye may be healed, in case of sickness as above. The context here forbids any wider meaning."

This exegesis of the great English commentator is at once consistent and satisfactory to the common sense of any reader not loaded down with a theory to support. Such men as Bengel and John Wesley state that "This single conspicuous gift which Christ committed to his apostles (Mark vi. 13) remained in the church

long after the miraculous gifts were withdrawn. Indeed it seems to have been designed to remain always, and St. James directs the elders, who were the most, if not the only, gifted men, to administer it. This was the whole process of physic in the Christian church until it was lost through unbelief.* That novel invention among the Romanists, practised not for cure, but where life is despaired of, bears no resemblance to this. . . . And the prayer of faith shall save the sick. From his sickness; and if any sin be the occasion of the sickness, it shall be forgiven him." — Wesley's Notes on New Testament.

Note Mr. Wesley did not say that oil was not in use among the Jews and other nations as a medicine. He did not touch the question of medicines at all except to declare that "among Christians" at that time this sacramental or symbolic anointing in the name of the Lord, with the "prayer of faith," was the "whole process, until it was lost through unbelief." We have shown, in the *Century* article, the overwhelming testimony to the existence of many hundreds of known

* That the early Christians used the anointing with oil and the laying on of hands is certain; but that this was *always* the whole "process of physic," *i. e.*, that they *never* used any of the many medicines current at the time, is nowhere proved.

remedies and medicines in the time of Christ. The very fact that there were so many in use utterly precludes the thought that James directed the use of oil medicinally for ANY AND ALL POSSIBLE DISEASES. Besides, the vast majority of sound opinion and authority is cast in the words of Alford quoted above; the anointing was a "symbolic and sacramental act" referred to in the very "words used for baptism." Surely this is enough to settle the matter finally.

We are now ready to inquire why, if "the prayer of faith shall save the sick," it happens that so very many who have been most devoutly anointed and prayed with are not healed. The rather hasty assumption that it is always and only because the sick man has not the faith is manifestly absurd, for by the express terms of the text he does not do the praying. Besides there are many cases where the invalid is insane, or delirious, or is a child, and cannot exercise faith; but the results in such cases average just about the same. Some are healed, and many are not. Again, to assume that the healing is denied because of sin in the patient is met by the express declaration that such sin shall be forgiven; and too many cases occur of devout, consecrated Christians whose sincerity cannot be questioned for a

moment. When Dr. Cullis and, afterwards, when Rev. A. B. Simpson and Rev. John A. Dowie prayed with the writer, there was just one thought in his mind, the glory of God in the will of God; yet the full healing did not come.

Granting the force and inspiration of the passage, there is just one explanation of the many failures. The "prayer of faith" is not prayed. If it were, we have the absolute assurance it "SHALL save the sick." But the sick are not saved. Therefore the "prayer of faith" was not offered. The elders greatly desired to pray in faith, but notwithstanding what James calls the "prayer of faith" certainly was not prayed, or the recovery must have followed. This is so simple that we will not spend further time upon it.

THE PRAYER OF FAITH.

What then is the "prayer of faith"? Does the Bible tell us? For if it does, that will explain all the difficulty. Most generally the full context is the best commentary, and in this instance it is notably true. James, translated correctly, fully defines what he means; and that definition, thoroughly grasped, sets at rest the whole matter, and satisfies every believing heart.

Following verses fourteen and fifteen James gives another direction, "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed." Then follows the plain definition of the kind of prayer necessary for the healing.

"THE EARNEST, INWROUGHT PRAYER OF A RIGHTEOUS MAN AVAILETH MUCH."

As we have it in the Authorized version the word "effectual" is not very clear. And yet it may be said that of course an "effectual" prayer must "avail." Such a translation, however, is really tautological. The strict sense of the Greek word is rather "inwrought," or "inworking," or "inenergized." Like a flash the whole thing is made clear. This "prayer of faith" is "inwrought" by the Holy Spirit in His special office of "making intercession for us" and teaching us how to pray. And when He inspires or inworks the prayer, of course it is "effectual;" of course it "avails," and the sick man is healed. On page 166 of D. H. we read these significant words, "Any one may be healed who is drawn of the Spirit to seek healing." How true! We may be drawn of our own desire to be free from suffering, or drawn by a mistaken notion of the purpose of God. In such cases the "prayer of faith" simply

cannot be offered. It is purely will power to attempt to "act faith" and make believe we are healed. It is all a mistake. God holds the "prayer of faith" in His own keeping, and when He "inworks" it, the result, the positive result, certainly comes.

When Mr. Dowie laid hands on the writer and prayed for his complete healing from all weakness in 1890, he was, by his own statement, specially anxious that healing should follow. He spoke of the wide publicity given to the "Atonement for Sin and Sickness," and of the many who had prayed for the author since his breakdown in 1887, and declared his special interest in his recovery. When the time for the prayer came, both men concentrated every faculty of mind and heart on the one point — that of faith in the promise as we both understood it. There was absolutely nothing in the way, so far as our personal knowledge extended. It would be precisely as reasonable for the writer to claim that something was wrong with Mr. Dowie, as for Mr. Dowie to say there was something wrong with the writer. Both were as honest as the sunlight, and as sincere as possible. The writer felt that a crisis had been reached, and called upon God with all his soul, at the same time endeavoring to "take hold by faith" with his full strength.

But all the time the prayer was being uttered the writer felt a sense of inability to touch something, just as if one tries to push an electric bell and is conscious that it does not quite make the connection. There was no sense of any possible fault, but purely of downright inability.

When the prayer was ended, Mr. Dowie stepped back, and with a shake of the head remarked, "Well, brother, I felt the power of God. And I am sure, if you hold on, the answer must come."

Why did he say that? We verily believe that it was the instinctive effort of the theory-controlled mind to ward off a sense of failure. It was the same principle which impels a boy to whistle in the dark to keep his courage up. He did NOT "feel the power of God," at least in the sense of healing power. He wanted to feel it, and the theory demanded that he should feel it; hence his instinctive declaration burst forth. But who will question that if the healing power had been really vouchsafed, as it was when Dr. Cullis prayed for my heart, the strength would have come?

The simple solution is that Mr. Dowie did NOT pray "the prayer of faith." Neither did Dr. Cullis, Mr. Simpson, or any other who ever prayed for my

complete strength to be given. If they had, beyond any controversy I would have been healed, for "the prayer of faith SHALL SAVE the sick." That is all there is to it. If God sends the faith, there is a case of genuine healing. If He does not send it, the sickness continues. AND NO CHRISTIAN SHOULD ALLOW THE ADVERSARY TO WHIP HIM BECAUSE HE IS NOT HEALED, WHEN HE IS CONSCIOUS OF A PERFECT ACQUIESCENCE IN THE WILL OF GOD.

As a positive clincher to this argument, turn to the twelfth chapter of I Corinthians. Here Paul distinctly informs us that in order to prevent our "ignorance" he writes of the "gifts of the Spirit." Over and over he assures us that there "are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit." The Holy Ghost is given inwardly to all, but the Holy Ghost imparts His gifts "as he will." He then states that "to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another FAITH by the same Spirit; to another the GIFTS OF HEALING by the same Spirit," etc.

Now, if some will claim that the "gifts of healing" only refer to the residence in some chosen elders of the gift to pray effectually with others, it is sufficient to reply that even this cannot be understood as always

operative in every case they may desire to heal, else why did not Paul heal Trophimus and Timothy? And the previous declaration that "faith" is given to one and not to another, is overwhelmingly conclusive. How can the "prayer of faith" be prayed at will, when it is distinctly affirmed by the apostle that the Spirit gives "faith" only to whom He chooses? * For does not the apostle add, "But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally AS HE WILL"? Here, then, we see that the "gifts of healing" and the "faith" through which such gifts can operate or be received, are equally under the special control of the Holy Spirit, and are given to one and not to another in the sovereign will of God.

But this forever settles adversely the claim that the Atonement offers health to all, precisely as it offers salvation from sin; for we all know and believe that there is no such arbitrary election in the matter of soul saving. "God would have all men to be saved and to come unto a knowledge of the truth." "Whosoever will, let him come and take of the water of life freely." There is no equality between the two in this dispensation. The one

* Of course this "faith" is that for special wonderful results, not faith for salvation from sin; that is free to all

is free to all, and offered to all; but the other is for those whom God chooses, and is not offered to all until the next age is ushered in. For that great consummation we, with the apostle and all nature, "do groan, and wait in hope." Meanwhile we do well to seek healing, scripturally and reverently, as we seek any other honest desire; and if God will, we shall be led of the Spirit to pray in the Spirit, and the healing will be given in the overflowing mercy of the Lord. But if God does not see fit to grant the prayer, there is not the slightest wrong in using any of the many alleviative or curative means created by the Maker of the universe, and working according to His great laws in nature. Very, very often, though God does not choose to heal directly as a miraculous or unusual putting forth of His power, He does choose to restore us through His laws of health and remedy in the more usual manner of His working. AND WE, AS OBEDIENT CHILDREN, MUST BE READY AND WILLING FOR EITHER.

Dr. Daniel Steele well makes the point of the difference between the "grace of faith," which is given to all, offered to all, and hence obligatory upon all who have any knowledge of Christ, and the "gift of faith," which is only bestowed upon those whom the Spirit selects,

and at such times as He chooses. The first, the "grace of faith," is spoken of in such texts as Eph. iv. 7, "But unto every one of us is given faith according to the measure of the gift of Christ," and Rom. xii. 3, "According as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith." The second, the "gift of faith," is referred to in I Cor. xii. 9–11, "To another faith by the same Spirit; . . . to every man severally as he will." The latter may be possessed coetaneously with a very low spiritual state. Paul declares a man may "remove mountains," but because of a lack of charity he "is nothing." John Wesley said, "Many have had the gift of faith who thereby cast out devils, and yet at the last have their portion with them." It is well to remember the warning of Christ that some would claim to have wrought miracles in His name, only to receive the reply, "I never knew you."

In this connection we take a glance at the eleventh of Hebrews, which has been called the "Westminster Abbey of the Bible." A recent writer in the *Christian Alliance* cites this chapter to prove the extreme position with regard to Faith Healing. He says that the devil tempted him by reminding him that "these all died," and that therefore he should not be surprised if

he died instead of recovering. But he thinks the Holy Spirit suggested that the additional words, "in faith," "these all died in faith," show that the theory is sound. He even goes so far as to say that "If I must die it shall be in faith, trusting Christ too much, not out of faith, trusting him too little." He then adds, "If with faith in Christ, my healer, I die,* I shall only go the more directly to the Christ of faith, and so be ever with the Lord."

It is with great tenderness that the writer says to all who fall into the snare of such false reasoning, Beware of "trusting Christ too much," fully as much as of "trusting Him too little." Remember that Satan first tempted Jesus to trust God too little; that is, to hold back from believing all God said. "IF thou be the Son of God." He was repelled with the Word. Returning to the attack, the second temptation was to "trust too much." "Cast thyself down from hence; for it is written, He shall give his angels charge over thee, and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone." But once more he was repelled with "Again it is written."

* How can a Christian who has "faith in Christ, the healer," happen to die? If the "faith" is genuine, it of course brings its literal answer. If it is not genuine, it is no faith at all.

Cannot our readers see that the "trusting too much" is the sin, or the failure of "presumption"? It is going too far, always the second temptation to the faithful soul. We are no better than our Master, and we may expect that the devil has no stronger or more cunningly devised temptations than he had in the Jordan wilderness.

But a common-sense glance at the reasoning quoted shows its inherent absurdity. The "faith" is first clearly that the sufferer shall recover. What else could it be? The sick man has "faith" for healing in the "Healer." How foolish, then, to whirl right about and make the "faith" stand simply for a blind, indefinite something — a reversal of the "healing," a dying instead. And the assertion that, if he died thus "trusting," he would go the "more directly to Christ" implies of course that all who do not so die are to that extent condemned and debarred. It is not necessary to follow this farther, as its own foolishness defeats it.

The chapter itself, Heb. xi., is of all others in the New Testament perhaps best calculated to illustrate that the "gift of faith" belongs distinctly to the Spirit, and is not open for all and to all at their pleasure, no matter how consecrated they are. "These all died in

faith." True. But they did die; they were not delivered from dying; they were not "healed by faith," except in a few notable instances. Sarah was healed of barrenness at an advanced age, in the special will of the Lord. And some "dead were raised to life." All the others mentioned were put to death or died; they were not delivered at all. The "in faith," therefore, does not mean at all what this mistaken writer indicates, but simply means that all these, no matter how severe their trials, held to their faith in God as God and as their Ruler and King. They did not lose their spiritual faith in God, though put to such extraordinary tests. Like Job, they trusted though actually slain. But this does not even hint at a relaxing all effort, a refusing to touch or use all possible means for their preservation. On the contrary the very words "they wandered about in sheepskins," etc., indicate that they ran away from their tormentors and persecutors. They were hunted like dogs or wild animals, but they fled when they clearly could do so. They did all possible to help themselves. They used all the "dens and caves in the earth" that were handy. The whole chapter sets before us most distinctly that God selects some for His glory, to whom at certain times He commits the "gift

of faith" for positive deliverance or with which to work some miracle. At such times those concerned are actually and positively delivered, but at other times the physical deliverance is withheld, while always, in either case, it is the Christian's duty and privilege to be fully "in faith."

He who attempts to "limit the Holy One of Israel" to any one line of action, whether in matters of "guidance" or salvation or healing, falls into an old error, and will surely be put to confusion. To say that God must heal by direct faith is as foolish as to say, with many, that He does not and will not heal by faith in these days.

NEW TESTAMENT POSITION.

The position of the New Testament concerning healing or health is certainly that of perfectly sustaining the Old Testament in its laws of health, seeing that those were laws of the constitution or nature of things, and remembering that Jesus came not to set aside the law, but to carry it out to the end. Note Jesus never said He HAD fulfilled all the law so that none of it was henceforth binding. He spoke of much of the law as still operative, and said of that, "not one jot or one tittle shall pass from the law TILL all be fulfilled." Mani-

festly the common laws of nature affecting animal health were not repealed in the slightest degree, and those laws hold to-day. The Old Testament position of strict obedience to the laws of health is therefore fully sustained by the New Testament, and all ordinary results follow as before.

But we see that the New Testament enunciates the principle of special faith in God for many things which do not come generally under the common law. "Have faith in God," said Jesus (Mark xi. 22), and in that faith we are told of wonders to be performed. Hence we find some warrant for the miraculous in a larger degree than in the dispensation of law under Moses. A careful examination of all the utterances and acts of Christ and His apostles, however, discloses the fact that these special manifestations of divine power, while falling distinctly under the newly stated law of "faith," are yet always directly under the guidance of the Spirit, and hence not open and free to all men who choose to merely believe.

Combining these facts, and comparing the statement of the Old Testament position on page 56, we see that the two fully agree so far as all ordinary health is concerned, and that no man has the slightest right to disregard the laws of health to-day because of the gospel; that the

gospel gives no man the warrant for living in unhealthy climates, for overworking, for eating forbidden food, for unduly exposing himself to the weather, or for doing any of the things which, by their very nature, violate the constitutional principles of health stated by Moses. The gospel promises to no modern missionary exemption from fever in African jungles, nor does it assure any evangelist or preacher that he may preach twice or three times a day in badly ventilated halls for any length of time without injury. He who does any of these things does them at his own risk, subject to the special will of God. If he escapes the fever in Africa, as in the case of Bishop Taylor, it is most likely because of a splendid heredity and the faithful observance of the most minute precautions as to eating, exercise and exposure, just as that Pauline man of God declares to be the reason for his phenomenal health. God may and sometimes undoubtedly does heal or prevent African fever in answer to "the prayer of faith," but ordinarily the laws of heredity and of health take their course.

The New Testament does emphasize the healing power of God; it does narrate cases of healing in plenty, generally as "signs following" the preaching of the gospel; and it does give specific directions to the sick how

to act (toward God) in all instances. It does hold out the HOPE of cure, for "any sick among you" is told to "call for the elders," who in turn are directed to pray for him with the symbolic "anointing in the name of the Lord." BUT WHEN THIS IS DONE, THE CASE IS LEFT WITH GOD. IF the "prayer of faith" has been offered, the result is sure. There is no statement that the cure will be directly instantaneous and miraculous; but there will be a cure. Not half a cure, but a cure. If the "faith" is not given or "inwrought" by the Holy Spirit, no cure will follow.* In either case — cure or no cure — there is nothing said either for or against the use of legitimate means. At least there is no doctrinal statement on this point. We must study the practical illustration afforded by the cases given and the experience of the best Christians to settle that matter.

* Of course it is only necessary to remind the reader of the occasional cures or partial cures brought about by the power of the imagination. The medical press supplies many such instances.

CHAPTER VI.

Cases of New Testament Examined.

A CAREFUL study of the recorded healings in the New Testament reveals several very important facts.

1. Jesus began His ministry with many miracles of healing. It is morally certain that He was not asked in any way to heal the first few cases. He simply did so of His own motion. Nobody knew He could heal until they saw Him actually do it. That He healed to establish His authority is unquestionable: His own references to the testimony of His works is conclusive here.

2. Jesus healed many cases without the slightest call for personal faith on their part, A sick man lying helpless, and not knowing Christ, is suddenly commanded to arise, the command carrying with it such an inspiration that he instantly obeys, and is perfectly healed. Simon's mother-in-law is "taken by the hand and lifted up." No command even is recorded. Demoniacs who asked nothing were delivered at a word from His mouth.

3. Some were healed at the request of their friends and because of their friends' faith, as the "man borne of four" and the centurion's servant.

4. Of some Christ clearly required faith. "Believest thou that I am able to do this?" and "According to thy faith be it unto thee," are sufficient to establish this point.

5. There is no instance recorded of any single request for healing being refused. He healed all who came and asked for healing.

6. There were times and places where more healings occurred than at others.* In some instances Jesus declared that lack of faith was the reason; that is, lack of faith in Him as the Messiah and teacher.

7. Not all these cases of disease were afflicted because of any sin. This the disciples, in common with their nation, rather believed to be true. Any special illness pointed to some sin on the part of the individual first; or if that looked unlikely, as in the case of a congenital trouble, the law of heredity pointed in their

* That there was the element of divine selection in the matter who can doubt. "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel," said Jesus. It is true that "as many as touched were made perfectly whole;" but think of the thousands in Israel who could not get to Him to touch at all, and think of the millions elsewhere on earth to whom He did not appear.

minds to a sin of the parents. Just as Job's friends were sure he must have greatly sinned in order to be so greatly afflicted, the disciples and Jews generally thought that the man born blind was so sent into the world either because of his parents' sin or on account of the sins he would commit in the future. But this point Jesus forever settled. "Neither did this man sin, nor his parents, but that the works of God should be manifested in him." Beyond all controversy, therefore, all sickness in this dispensation is not on account of sin in the individual. It may be a dispensation of the sovereign will of God.

On this point, stop for a moment and think of those poor specimens of humanity who come into the world crippled out of all form and shape; of those who are born idiots, never to know the clear light of reason, and of all the terrible list of congenital diseases transmitted from parents to children. Many of them are beyond all power of healing, and never are healed. Who ever saw or heard of a little broken-backed cripple, three feet high, with misshapen head set between humped shoulders, being suddenly taken and stretched up to the full and perfect stature of a man? Why has God not chosen to divide such monstrosities as the "New

Siamese Twins," a picture of whom is before us, showing the children united from umbilicus to middle of sternum. Why, it is evident that such a case would have caused the profoundest sensation at any time; but even in the healings of our Lord there is no clear record of any such. Neither is there a plain statement that Christ or an apostle ever restored a limb that was wholly lost. These facts point most overwhelmingly to the special will of the Lord as the true ground for healing in all cases.

8. Under the apostles not all who were sick were healed. True we do not read of any one asking them for healing and being refused; but we do read of some Christians who were not immediately healed, or who had troubles that were not removed at all. Trophimus was "left" by the apostle Paul "sick." Why did he not heal him and take him along? No reason can be assigned except that the Lord evidently intended otherwise; that is, that God specially controls such cases. Epaphroditus was very ill from overwork, but God "had mercy on him" and on Paul, and finally answered prayer for his recovery. But there is no evidence of any miraculous, sudden cure. It was an "answer to prayer."

Timothy's case has not been treated fairly in D. H. or any similar work. There it is, the favorite "son" of the great apostle, full of good teaching from his childhood, blessed with a splendid spiritual heredity from his mother and grandmother, specially used of God and the chosen companion of Paul. Yet he was partly an invalid. And he was "often" afflicted. To suppose that Paul did not anoint or lay hands upon him and pray for his strengthening and healing, is to suppose the apostle was not a man at all. He who sent handkerchiefs to the sick at a distance, could he not heal his own "son in the gospel"? Evidently he could not and did not. His advice to Timothy to use light wine "for his stomach's sake and his frequent sicknesses" (or infirmities, or weaknesses, as it may be translated) is conclusive evidence that the situation was accepted by the apostle. Had there been any such thing as an "Atonement right" in the matter, Paul COULD NOT have accepted it. Who has any business to neglect any portion of the present fruits of the Atonement? It is our duty to preach and teach all the benefits of that sacrifice that can be received now and here. We are not the judges of how much we may accept.

9. All the cases recorded were cases of full and complete healing. They "were made perfectly whole."

A review of these nine points teaches us that the standing of healing in the New Testament is very different from that of sin. For the forgiveness of the latter personal faith is always a necessity. God does not thrust salvation upon any man, but He does so sometimes heal. The late John Cookman often said, "I was not asking for healing, but God put it upon me when the doctors had all given me up to die and gone home. God spoke to me and I was healed." This healing was practically instantaneous, and Mr. Cookman lived to do the best work of his life for several years. But afterwards he sought in vain for a similar deliverance in other troubles.

While Jesus never refused to heal, Paul did not always succeed with his own friends, to say nothing of his own famous "thorn." The latter case we have avoided because of the difficulty in proving to any one's satisfaction just whether the thorn was a sickness or not. The extreme claim that it was healed or removed cannot well be demonstrated in any case, so that may be set aside for those instances where we are in no doubt at all.

From all these we see that the New Testament cases amply carry out the doctrinal teaching derived from our study of the evangelists and the epistles. And in view of the plain direction of James to the sick, and his definition of the "prayer of faith," coupled with Paul's declarations concerning the "gifts of the Spirit," we see that the cases of Trophimus, Epaphroditus and Timothy take their place under the general law, "as he will." Job in the Old Testament and Timothy in the New stand as monumental illustrations of the great fact that while the Atonement has purchased bodily deliverance for believers, for the present we live physically under the ordinary law of God for health, and must relegate the matter of special healing or affliction to the realm of the supreme will of our Lord.

CHAPTER VII.

The Practical Position.

TO Dr. Charles Cullis undoubtedly belongs the distinction of having done more than any other man to bring healing by faith to the attention of the church in the last century. His little book called "Faith Cures" gives a brief sketch of how his mind was drawn to the promise in James, and how he waited for a case in which the patient would accept the direction as from God. Such a case presented itself soon. A lady was suffering with an internal tumor, from which no relief appeared except by the knife, and that looked dangerous. He read the verses in James to her, she consented, he prayed, anointing her with oil in the name of the Lord, and the lady was speedily healed. She lives to-day and is at the head of a missionary training college in Brooklyn.

Dr. Cullis often spoke confidentially and freely to the writer in his home in Somerset Street and afterwards in Newbury Street, Boston, on this subject. He said in

effect: "The promise is plain. 'Let any sick among you' — that is, among Christians — 'call for the elders.' Now I am sure I am an elder. If called, I must obey the direction, 'Let them pray, anointing with oil in the name of the Lord.' That is my business. Then the matter is in the Lord's hands, and He is responsible. 'The prayer of faith shall save the sick.' I never doubt it." The doctor specially disclaimed the possession of any "gifts of healing." Further, he often said, "Many times when I seem to feel the greatest assurance, the case is not healed at all; and, on the other hand, frequently when I am as dead and lifeless as possible, the most remarkable healings occur."

Dr. Cullis was a physician. He gave and used medicines, recognizing that the ordinary was to be met by the ordinary. Taking a little bottle from his pocket, he said, "Now I know that this will stop my headache in a few minutes. Knowing that, I think it would be wrong to trouble the Lord about it, or expect Him to effect the cure in any unusual way."

When the writer first become aware of the doctor's suffering with heart disease, he was startled at Intervale, N. H., one bright afternoon, by the request, "Say, Captain, I wish you would come in the chapel and pray with me for my heart.

"Oh yes, didn't you know? I have it bad, the worst kind, angina pectoris. Dr. Bell says there is no earthly hope. Some nights I think I cannot live till morning."

Reverently we kneeled, and the prayer was offered, with the anointing. Rising from our knees, the doctor in his characteristic way, after a half-breathed "Praise the Lord!" suddenly turned, and said, with his eyes twinkling, "See here! You know I have prayed with thousands and thousands of people, and, as you know, many hundreds have been wonderfully healed. But I have been prayed with in London, and at Mannedorf, and by a lot of you here in America, but (here the merry smile shone in his mirthful eyes) none of you fellows do me one bit of good. Now what's the matter?"

Of course we could not tell, and the blessed man's hearty "Well, hallelujah anyhow! it's all right" left the matter in God's hands, where it belonged. His malady marched on, and without a shadow on his heart, his last audible word a "Hallelujah," Charles Cullis passed over to the God in whose word he so delighted to trust. HE "DIED IN FAITH."

Dr. Cullis believed in setting broken bones, and in

taking medicines except where faith was perfectly free and spontaneous, notably in "incurable cases."

It will be seen therefore that the PRACTICAL position occupied by Dr. Cullis was that of special healing in the will of the Lord. This was what his practice actually amounted to. He never was given to preaching the matter doctrinally, but urged all to come to God in faith and be guided by the Spirit.

Rev. A. B. Simpson has long PRACTICALLY occupied the same position. While he has always preached healing from a doctrinal standpoint, yet his utterances and his consideration of the subject have moderated greatly from his earlier deliverances. He never gave the matter a place equal with soul salvation, but it was pressed to a considerable extent. The experience of his workers and himself has been that sickness may come unexpectedly, and often take its full course, medicine or no medicine, no matter how much they pray. At other times marked and quite abrupt healings have occurred.

Years ago it was quite apparent that Mr. Simpson's eyes were failing as he grew older. At that time he remarked that he had often thought he must set apart a special time for prayer for his sight. But the ordinary and natural effect went steadily on.

A few years ago Mr. Simpson was attacked with the grippe, and suffered greatly, though refusing to give up and go to bed. The disease ran a reasonable course, and then abated. There was no phenomenal healing. Of course prayer was offered by many, and of course it is Christian and just to claim an "answer," but nothing more. This has been the experience of nearly every one in that work. But some for whom great intercession was made have been taken in the prime of life. Of course Mr. Simpson has always allowed that one's time may come, and the faith not be given, but the point here is that practically the position has been one of special answers in the will of God, not a broad Atonement for all at any time.

Nothing has so operated to force this upon the "Christian Alliance" and its founder as the failure of the holiest missionaries to withstand the African fever purely by faith. Many went out a few years ago, protesting with dear Charlie Miller (of the Bishop Taylor Mission) they were "living in the ninety-first Psalm, and the Lord would keep them." But a large number passed away, one after another; and all were finally driven to see that natural law, given and made by God, operates to-day just as it ever did. Most of the

missionaries have used quinine and other remedies freely, and all have been and are instructed to observe most carefully the rules of the climate for rest and food and clothing.

Possibly the Christian Alliance for a time lost more missionaries in proportion to the whole number than some of the regular boards, it may be because this very faith impelled many weak and frail persons to offer to go, and constrained the directory to accept their services. But some time ago it was seen that this would not do, and the board of managers have insisted on some sort of physical qualifications for the work. The phenomenal missionary collections taken by the Alliance last year (some $225,000.00 in two collections at Old Orchard and New York) show that the people are deeply stirred to give through this particular channel; and it is a matter for thankfulness that the item in the Alliance creed concerning healing is getting upon a more solid and sure foundation. It is the foundation of the sovereign will of God and the obedience to all His laws as far as possible. This is clearly shown by the special call issued at the Christian Alliance convention held in October, 1892, "praying for a *special* outpouring of the Spirit in connection with acquiring foreign languages

and *resisting the climatic difficulties of Africa, India and China.*"

Dr. A. J. Gordon, that almost unmatched example of the union in one man of deepest spirituality with broadest mental powers and strongest physical parts, stood PRACTICALLY on this same foundation. He anointed and prayed with many. Some were healed. A case of restoration when dying with consumption, and almost *in articulo mortis*,* is given in the admirable study on his life by his son, Ernest Gordon (a book which should be in the library of every minister, and be read by every Christian). Dr. Gordon gave to the writer his confidence on this subject in one of the all too few brotherly conferences we enjoyed together in Boston. One or two cases he related in his own experience, where he prayed with the sick, were certainly miracles of healing, or nothing. But Dr. Gordon saw that the divine sovereignty stood over all, and that we can only pray in the will of God.

Mrs. Carrie Judd Montgomery, whose remarkable healing occurred just about the time Dr. Cullis prayed with the writer, is a well-known and valued friend, as is her devout and earnest husband, George Montgomery

* See Appendix to this book.

of Beulah, Cal. Mrs. Montgomery is a persistent teacher of Faith Healing, and does not like any one to attempt much modification of the theory. But from the most positive knowledge the writer declares that PRACTICALLY, after all is said and done, there is no real difference in her case. She prays with many. Some are healed. Many are not. Some of her own friends have passed away after long seasons of most earnest prayer, although quite young. Somehow they "could not take hold." But that simply means, as we have seen, that the faith was not "inwrought." The Lord willed otherwise. Mr. Montgomery frankly acknowledges that he is not perfectly well, and at times he is severely troubled. He "holds on" as consistently and persistently as any one we ever knew (except poor Charlie Miller), but the complete healing does not come. The practical conclusion must be that it is not God's will. His wife is nearsighted and has worn glasses from childhood. The Montgomerys are among the most prominent teachers of healing on the Pacific coast, and are noted for their beneficent gifts and good works.

Mrs. Baxter of London, who has been long identified with the Faith Healing teaching at Bethshan, years ago

became persuaded that the Atonement theory required her to "trust God for her eyes." Accordingly she went through a season of special consecration and prayer, and in order to "act faith," laid aside her glasses. For a long time she held on, but no improvement in sight was granted; and at last she declares that "The Lord said to me, 'My child, I did not tell you to take off those glasses. You have gone ahead of the Spirit in this matter. You must await my time and guidance.'" At once she put them on, and has continued to wear them. This case has many parallels, and is a thorough illustration of the position taken in this present book, that HEALING BY FAITH IN THIS AGE IS A MATTER OF SPECIAL FAVOR FROM GOD, AND IS ALWAYS PECULIARLY UNDER THE GUIDANCE AND LEADING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. In very many cases it is certain that no healing is granted, no matter how consecrated the person may be.

Rev. John Alexander Dowie is a "stalwart." No more aggressive teacher of the Atonement theory has ever appeared. To this he devotes the major portion of his time, giving a regular series of "lectures" on Divine Healing, leading his audience gradually from one step to another, and afterwards forming everywhere he goes

"Divine Healing Associations." Under Mr. Dowie's ministrations some very remarkable cases of healing have certainly occurred. When George Montgomery was said to be dying with diabetes, Mr. Dowie prayed with him, some eight years ago, and he was raised up. Well-authenticated cases of cancer have been cured, some in a few hours, as in the instance, so widely reported, of the woman in Australia who had a cancer back of one eye, closing it and preventing any vision, which burst and discharged immediately after the prayer, and healed up in a few days, the sight being fully restored. An instance of the healing of a boy born blind occurred in Southern California, and many others quite as remarkable. In some cases physicians have testified to the complete restoration of conditions which ordinarily require positive surgery. Some of these cases we know well. See the appendix for more on this subject.

But after all this is allowed, it is certain that very many with whom Mr. Dowie prays are not healed. In his own report of a trial in Chicago in which he figured as defendant, he tells how some invalids were recommended to return home after spending some time at his boarding houses because "they evidently have not the faith." These were taught as thoroughly as the rest, but they

"could not take hold." A minister of the gospel, a friend of the writer, who had been given up to die by his physicians with diabetes, was so much helped that in a few months he wrote he felt able to "go through a troop and leap over a wall;" while his wife, a most consecrated lady, was not helped at all, finding herself "unable to grasp the healing."

No teacher of Faith Healing has ever forced the conclusion so strongly as Mr. Dowie, that if there is failure in any case it must be from some deficiency on the part of the subject. He seemed to always ASSUME that HE prayed in "faith." Hence, since there is healing in the Atonement for everybody, everywhere, at all times and seasons (except the time for death), provided they only believe fully and withhold nothing, the conclusion is irresistible that some sin must lurk somewhere, or some wilful failure in faith exist.* But in the face of the known character and spirit of very many who have thus sought healing, and of their clear testimony to the witness of acceptance with God in their hearts, this explanation is worse than foolish. As already remarked, it would be precisely as much in order for the subjects to claim that

* More than a century ago this view was urged in England, and Dr. Samuel Johnson aptly condemned it as proving always that "the sick man is a rascal."

Mr. Dowie was some way wrong when he attempted to pray with those who did not receive, specially as the prayer is offered by him and not by the subject.

In the earlier portion of his ministry Mr. Dowie was simply unsparing in his denunciation of what he called "eye-crutches." No one was allowed any excuse. The theory was so clear and so consistent that of course the eyes must be given to God for healing as well as any other organ. Over and over the writer has listened to this sharp scourging of the Christians who were wearing the obnoxious "eye-crutches." And many a believer in healing has suffered not a little under this teaching because, as in the case of Mrs. Baxter, they simply could not get perfect sight. When the writer, in 1891, remarked to Mr. Dowie that his eyes were evidently failing, since he naturally held print almost at arm's length to read it, Mr. Dowie rather indignantly rejected the suggestion and insisted that he could read anywhere, but had fallen into the habit unthinkingly. Knowing medical facts and theories, the writer was well aware that the unconscious testimony of the senses was the stronger, but he said nothing further. He was a trifle surprised, however, to hear in the short space of two or three years that Mr. Dowie was himself wearing "eye-crutches," although not

much over fifty years of age and a man of tremendous natural strength.

From these facts it is clear that Mr. Dowie's position after all is PRACTICALLY the same as the rest — a special answer to prayer as the Spirit wills. Multitudes seek healing, but many do not obtain, WHILE THOSE WHO ARE GIVEN A SPECIAL HEALING IN A NOTABLE AFFECTION ALMOST ALWAYS FIND AFTERWARD THAT OTHER COMPLAINTS FAIL TO BE CURED BY THE SAME MEANS OR BY ANY MEANS AT ALL.

It is not necessary to follow these illustrations any farther. It is evident that the results in all cases are about the same, and most of the leading teachers of the more extreme view are gradually coming to see that God does as He pleases, and what He pleases, and acts when He pleases, and that it is best for us not to be too dogmatic, or to attempt to limit Him within our narrow lines, but to accept His will any way and all ways.

The writer of this book, though the author of D. H., never did give much time to the theory or teaching of Faith Healing. Scores of times he has been known to ell his audiences, "Any man can go to heaven from a k body, but no one can with a sick soul. Salvation must be first." From a careful consultation of his note-

book, in which every sermon preached is recorded, with time and place, it appears that in the course of ten or eleven years following his own healing he only preached some twelve times specifically on the subject. This is sufficient. He was brought to see the mistake of the general Atonement theory about seven years ago, chiefly through the irresistible logic of the conclusion that if healing was absolutely open to all at all times, then nothing but sin could account for the failure to receive it; and that this conclusion was simply untenable for a moment in the face of a vast multitude of facts, forced him to again examine the Word for the proper argument in the premises, with what result this book testifies.

CHAPTER VIII.

Conclusion.

IN using the word "practically" so frequently we mean that the PRACTICE of all the teachers mentioned really amounts to the special trust in God after all is said and done. No matter what may be taught, no matter what may be said in a theoretical way, the actual results in all experience follow the general principles stated in this little book. Hence we say that, no matter how strongly some of the teachers mentioned may still claim the Atonement theory of healing as open to everybody, everywhere, at any time, if only they fill all human conditions of consecration and trust, yet practically all the above teachers have found that this simply will not and does not work in multitudes of cases. For these failures the different persons account somewhat differently, but the practical results are the same. We hope, therefore, to call their attention to the real facts of the situation and aid them in getting on the solid ground of the Scriptures and of experience.

Mr. Simpson wrote long ago in his magazine, *The Word, Work and World*, as follows: "Divine Healing fully recognizes the sovereignty of God and the state and spiritual attitude of the individual." There is no doubt that at this time in the ages the "sovereignty of God" is the chief factor to be considered in cases of "answers to prayer" of whatever kind, outside the plain matter of forgiveness of sin, which is so absolutely stated to be always His will as to need no discussion.

It will be seen therefore that this book attacks only one special point in the doctrine of "The Atonement for Sin and Sickness," that of the absolute right of any believer to claim healing at any time because of Jesus' sacrificial offering of Himself for us. It says not one word against the "prayer of faith," but strongly indorses it. It does not deprecate "praying with the sick," but advises all believers to follow the scriptural direction in such cases. It has no purpose to discredit well-authenticated cases of positive healing through faith; it claims that we must give up all truth received through evidence if some of these cases be not accepted. It has nothing to say against an individual declining to take medicines in hopeless cases, where medical skill is confessedly at fault and can do nothing; but it does

claim that there is not sufficient warrant, either in the Bible or in early church history, for the statement that medicines are never to be used or that early Christians never used them. It advocates the position that God always expects us to do for ourselves what we know or think we can do, and that He does not excuse us on account of our ignorance or mistaken theories, but generally allows His laws to march on to a finish.

That most apostolic man and missionary, Dr. John G. Paton, tells us of an occasion when he found himself confronted by a mob of angry savages, who levelled their guns at his head, evidently bent on his destruction. He kneeled, helpless and alone. No speech came from him; his eyes failed, but he prayed; and as he prayed, he declares, "As never before the words came to me, 'Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name I will do it,' and I knew that I was safe." A constraining power fell upon his foes, and the guns were lowered. He had prayed "the prayer of faith" inwrought by the Holy Spirit.

But this same apostolic man plainly states, "I HAVE EVER MOST FIRMLY BELIEVED, AND DO BELIEVE, THAT ONLY WHEN WE USE EVERY LAWFUL AND POSSIBLE MEANS FOR THE PRESERVATION OF OUR LIFE, WHICH IS

GOD'S SECOND GREATEST GIFT TO MAN (HIS SON BEING THE FIRST), CAN WE EXPECT GOD TO PROTECT US, OR HAVE WE THE RIGHT TO PLEAD HIS PRECIOUS PROMISES."

When Dr. Paton secured the most wonderful answer to prayer in the discovery of water — a discovery which God used to turn the hardest hearts to Him — it was found only after the most painful physical work. Dr. Paton did all he could before the water was found. We have known some very devout Christians to refuse all "means" and fight along "by faith," as they said and thought, till most deplorable conditions and even death followed. No one can read the record of Charlie Miller's case, as he contended against the dread African fever for three weeks, refusing aid of any kind, testifying freely and continually that his trust was only in God, asserting that "a steady faith wins," and declaring that he did not have the fever, until his last conscious cry to Mr. Withey to call Dr. Summers as he was simply choking to death; and then follow him through the additional week of delirium to his last breath, without seeing that Charlie Miller was built of heroic stuff, and that no man could possibly "act faith" further than he did. His death was a solemn object

lesson to all who held the extreme theory, and has often been pondered upon by the writer of the book which (he deeply mourns) perhaps helped Miller to take the position he did.

Recently one of these honestly mistaken Christians, well known to the writer, went for over forty days without the slightest peristalsis,* determined to "hold on" till God healed her directly. But God sent a good Christian lady physician, who saved her life by the most common-sense means.

We are frequently told that "God never made medicines," He "made the plant, but not the preparation." It is hardly necessary to dwell upon such folly, but we may reply that while God never made certain preparations, nor did He ever make a syringe or a surgical instrument, yet it is equally true God never made a toothbrush, or a cake of soap, nor a host of things suited to our present welfare which He has guided the race to discover how to make for themselves. To assert that remedies "are not His way for His children"† at any and all times, is to assert what cannot be proven. On the contrary, many times God chooses to grant signal deliverance through remedies after the individual has

* Bowel action. † Mr. Simpson.

tried to "act faith" even for years. The case of the lady just mentioned is conclusive on this point. God saved her through a physician and remedies, after she had "trusted God to heal" without any remedies down to the very door of death.

When the writer had sought healing through faith, and used only the "scriptural means" of prayer and anointing with oil, and had "acted his faith" so desperately as many times to calmly take the platform and preach when sound medical opinion regarded it as very doubtful whether he would live through the effort; after he had thus gone on for YEARS, he was led to try some medicines, mainly, as he told the medical friend who prescribed for him, "to see if it might be God's will to heal or help in that way." The first attempt was a failure, but after the second, with a different school, he was speedily lifted out of a condition of mental depression and nervous prostration which had prevailed for a long time, and at once began to preach and work, accomplishing more in six months than he had been able to do in three years. And this "resorting to means" did not have the predicted effect of causing a "spiritual loss of that nearness to God which comes from such a constant dependence upon the Lord for the body."

On the contrary, he was filled with joy, and praised God continually for His goodness and mercy, and was conscious of as much spiritual communion as he ever knew at any time.

On this point the testimony of a most intelligent witness may be profitable. After years of trusting without remedies, a Christian lady of San Francisco, Mrs. S. A. Kelley, who had been raised up from consumption in answer to Mr. Dowie's prayer, finally, at the writer's advice, concluded to try for other troubles a severe surgical operation. It was performed with good results, and the lady writes of her spiritual experience, which some friends thought must suffer after such a "going back:" "I cannot express the joy I have in the liberty wherewith Christ hath set me free. It seems as if all my capacity for receiving the boundless wealth of God has been enlarged a thousandfold. I never loved God so much as now, and never felt such precious sense of the abiding, indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit."

The distinguished evangelist, Major J. H. Cole of Michigan, was for a time an earnest believer in the extreme theory. Speaking of his experience to the writer a few years ago he said: "I used to be dreadfully

in bondage. If I was a little sick I was whipping myself and asking, What have I done wrong? What's the matter? And when I could not find a reason I was all mixed up. But now I'm as free as the air. If God wants me to be sick, I say Hallelujah! And if He wants me to be well, I say the same. I just do the best I can, and trust in His great love, and am wonderfully restful about it. If I am ill, I commit it all to God, then I do the best I possibly can, and praise Him for the result."

A few days ago* the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, sitting at Staunton, Va., refused to ordain a candidate for the ministry partly because he believed in and practised praying with the sick for healing, even though his friends explained that he also believed in medicines. When such things are done by official bodies, and when the "elders of the church," though soberly requested by their members to solemnly pray with them according to the scriptural direction and promise in James, refuse to do so, with more or less contempt and pity for "such folly," it is no wonder that simple believers, who cling devotedly to "all scripture, given by inspiration of God," may occasionally swing rather to an extreme. When

* April 2, 1897.

the "shepherds of Israel" are spoken against by the Lord because "the diseased have ye not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick" (Ezek. xxxiv. 4), they need not be surprised if the people sometimes become a little mixed as to the exact truth.

To despise or explain away the simple directions of the Word is quite in keeping with the critical scepticism of our day. When it can be reported in the daily press that the ministers constituting a large and influential city "preachers' meeting," "with two exceptions put themselves on record as not believing in the full inspiration of the Scriptures," it is no wonder that the "symbolic and sacramental act" of "anointing with oil in the name of the Lord" is sneered at and classed as a "superstition."*

Let us look for a moment upon a picture. A Christian has fallen ill, and the indications seem to be serious. A messenger is despatched to the house of his pastor to tell of the sickness and to ask his attendance as soon as possible. With the pastor come one or two of the official men of the church, all deeply inter-

* If the "anointing with oil" in James means a rubbing with a medicine, then so does the statement concerning the early ministry of the disciples in Mark vi. 13: "And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them." Remember James was one of those who did this.

ested in the welfare of their suffering brother. Arrived at the house, they are informed by the patient or his family that he desires to be solemnly committed to God, and to have them "pray over him" according to the special injunction of the apostle. Thus "called," the "elders of the church" reverently kneel beside the bed; the pastor prays with full confidence that he is in God's order, and asks that the power of the Lord may be granted to heal the sufferer, if that be possible in the divine will. With reverent solemnity he touches the symbolic oil to the forehead of the sick man, and joining with him, the elders "lay hands" upon him "in the name of the Lord." In the final words of prayer the whole case is committed to God, while strength, wisdom and patience in the divine will are asked for all within the home. Perfectly sure that if God has granted by His Spirit the "inwrought" prayer, "the prayer of faith," the sick man will recover; and in any event confident that the simple commands of the Word have been carried out, and all done towards God that is in their power, they take their leave with a blessing on their lips and a renewed sense of their absolute dependence upon God in their hearts.

What can there be in the above to offend the slight-

est Christian belief or instinct? What is there more in the symbolic use of literal oil than in the symbolic use of literal water in baptism? What possible objection to the "laying on of hands" any more than the same practice in the ordination of deacons and ministers? And what mode of procedure could be better calculated to properly educate the family in a simple faith in God and a dependence upon Him for all things? Of course if the physician who has been summoned is himself a genuine Christian man, he knows only too well how easily the thread of life may at any moment slip beyond his control, and therefore he can least of all afford to neglect the honest effort to secure the aid of the Almighty, and will welcome the prayers of those who believe in God.

When that man of God, the late Dr. A. J. Gordon of Boston, lay in his last illness, he was attended by a physician, himself a most devout believer in the "prayer of faith." The service of consecration and prayer, with the "anointing in the name of the Lord," was held, and all was solemnly placed in God's hands. But this being done, it was still felt to be right to do all that scientific knowledge and experience taught to be probably or possibly useful, and nothing was left undone which skill

and affection prompted. But God had spoken, and the "inwrought prayer" was not granted. From the fulness of the many harvests planted by that consecrated hand, Dr. Gordon passed to his reward, in the glorious assurance of a sanctified spirit. But who will dare to say that either he or his were any the worse for that simple service of prayer in obedience to the injunction of the Word?

Why cannot a Christian at once apprehend the proper office of the "means of faith"? What do we mean? Consider. The rams' horns at Jericho, the pitchers and lamps of Gideon, Samson's jawbone of an ass, David's sling, Elijah's ravens, the widow's cruse of oil, the mantle in Elisha's hands, the ditches of Jehoshaphat in the desert, the staff of Elisha laid on the dead son of the Shunamite, the water of Jordan as Naaman bathed in its current, the pool of Siloam, the anointing with oil by the disciples, — which of these was in itself efficacious? Which of these in any sense did the work? The jawbone was insignificant against the Philistines. The meal and oil were nothing for the support of three people. The stick thrown into the water could float itself, but by no possibility could it cause the iron to swim. The ditches could not bring water to Jehosha-

phat. The staff on the child's body in no scientific sense whatever kept or gave life. The waters of Jordan never washed away leprosy. Siloam could not open the eyes of the blind. The priest could do nothing for the leper. The exercise of the will did not vitalize the withered arm. The anointing with oil never healed anybody. *Were these means efficacious we would not look farther, having natural confidence in the means employed. But some particular actions, in the doing of which our spirit of obedience and of confidence in God is tested, constitute the "means of faith."* Whatever real trust or dependence we have or can summon is thrown upon the invisible God whom we believe to be behind it all. This is the scientific law, if you will, and it is as simple as it is scientific, the scientific "law of faith." Hence the reasonableness of these apparently useless means.

We are to "do all we can," as Dr. Paton so well says; but let us not forget that simple obedience is one of the things we can do. "Calling the elders" is no harder than calling the doctor, and prayer costs at least no more than physic. It is very true that we ought not to neglect "works," but neither should we neglect "faith." At neither extreme can the pendulum rest. Surely we need FAITH and WORKS.

APPENDIX.

HEART DISEASE.

MRS. CAROLINE TALBOT.

POSSIBLY no other female preacher of the Quaker church during the last twenty years was more widely known in the United States and England than Caroline Talbot. For a long time she was afflicted with heart trouble so badly that she could not even walk across the street, and sometimes fainted while attempting to cross a room. She spoke sitting in a chair, and was obliged to sleep with a chair and pillows behind her in the bed. It was impossible for her to arrange her hair without frequently dropping her arms, and in many ways she needed assistance constantly. Although deemed unable to travel, she reached Old Orchard Beach in Maine during a convention held there by Dr. Charles Cullis in the summer of 1881, going there, however, to attend another meeting in the line of woman's work.

difficulty, remained up all day, visited the meeting in the afternoon, and gave this testimony, closing it with the words "And now I am well."

Four or five years after, the writer was driving Mrs. Talbot to the depot at Chester, Pa., after entertaining her at his house. He asked about her heart; whereupon she fixed her piercing dark eyes upon him, lifted an impressive finger, and replied emphatically:

"Kelso Carter, I tell thee that I have never known I had a heart from that day to this."

Shortly after she was taken down with typhoid fever, and was attended by her old family physician; who said, "Mrs. Talbot, it is well you got rid of that heart trouble, or you never could have come through this fever." Several years later she died from another cause.

The above are facts, as absolute as human evidence can ever hope to furnish. Mrs. Talbot's heart was thoroughly examined by able practitioners before and after her healing. Besides this, the typhoid fever made a searching examination of the most practical kind, but no fault remained in the heart. Her tremendous will had been exerted to its utmost for years, sufficing to carry her through many exertions, but failing utterly to

relieve her sufferings or to change her fundamental symptoms. When Dr. Cullis was called, she did not know his name. She received his suggestion, trusted God with the faith which then and there seemed to be "inwrought" by the Spirit, and was healed so positively and completely that no trace remained. This healing was permanent, and the disease never reappeared. She had other sicknesses, and could not always obtain relief from them by the same means of faith. She was known to thousands; her sufferings had been observed for years; the writer was well acquainted with her, and investigated the above points as thoroughly and scientifically as any one could. If Mrs. Talbot did not have organic heart disease, then it is impossible for medical men's opinions, joined with long history of cases and characteristic symptoms in abundance, to ever establish the fact. That she was cured as related, almost instantaneously, completely and permanently, is beyond contradiction or doubt. Finally, we note that she afterwards prayed for healing for some other troubles, but could not obtain healing in that way, while at other times she claimed answers to prayer for relief.

SCIATICA.

MISS JENNIE SMITH.

It is unnecessary to go into the details of this famous case. The writer has known Miss Smith for years, and has read her little book giving the account in full of her marvellous restoration to health. Miss Smith is well known as the "Railroad Evangelist," and formerly travelled thousand of miles in the baggage cars, lying in her little wheeled cot, and preaching to the men as she went. One leg was terribly affected with some trouble resembling a frightful sciatica, for which everything had been done that could be done, one or more nerves being finally severed to stop the pain and convulsions. While a number of friends were gathered round her praying, she was healed, and soon rose up and walked. She has continued well of that trouble for many years, and still carries on her evangelistic work. (At the present writing she is holding a meeting here in Baltimore.) Her residence has been at Mountain Lake Park, Md., for some time.

That Miss Jennie Smith was pronounced incurable by able physicians, that she suffered years in helplessness, that she was raised up as described, and that the

old trouble has not returned in years, are unquestionable facts to which multitudes of witnesses can testify. It may be noted that she has not always been able to secure immediate and perfect healing of other complaints by the same means, while at times she claims to have been healed in answer to the prayer of faith.

GENERAL PROSTRATION.

REV. JOHN COOKMAN.

About twelve years ago John Cookman, after a severe illness, was given up by his physicians. The strongest medicines failed to cause sleep, and the doctor went home. After a long period of heart-searching, Cookman lost consciousness and slept sweetly. Waking in the morning, he lay quietly enjoying a sense of the Lord's presence. Suddenly a voice seemed to say to him, "I am thy Saviour and thy healer, thy sanctifier and thy Lord." Cookman was healed, and immediately engaged in religious work to a greater extent than ever before. He labored diligently, spoke of his healing in many parts of the country, was indefatigable in his advocacy of the doctrine of Faith Healing, but was taken ill some years afterwards with a complication of

diseases. Much prayer was made for him, but after a great deal of suffering he passed away. In this last sickness it is said that some of his old symptons reappeared. He had been afflicted with rheumatism and consequent heart disease in former years, but that he was suddenly raised up, as related, and continued working hard in health and strength for years, is beyond dispute. Being so well known, his case excited a great deal of comment, and his widely given testimony led to much discussion.

BROKEN AND STIFF JOINT.

MRS. F. P. CHURCH.

For several years the writer had heard of a reported case of immediate healing of a broken wrist, and had often desired to sift the report to the bottom. In 1893 he was providentially thrown in direct company with the subject, and resided in the same house for several weeks. The wished-for sifting was done, and the wrist carefully examined with the best ability at hand. The lady, Mrs. Church, lives at San Leandro, near Oakland, Cal., and is a strongly built woman of middle age. Many years ago her wrist was badly broken and shat-

tered by an accident. It was set, but healed stiff and crooked, the hand bending outward. Some nerve filament was caught in the little bones of the wrist, causing the most excruciating pain. The wrist was treated by several physicians during a number of years, but to no good purpose. The sufferer was obliged to wear a strong case about the arm to protect it from accidental blows. At night this was taken off and the arm placed carefully on a pillow. This condition of things lasted some nine years, the arm being quite helpless, and the suffering intense and almost continuous. Mrs. Church had not heard the subject of healing by faith specially discussed, but was led by her own agony to cry to God for help. No one else prayed with her. At last, just after a new case had been made for the wrist, she prayed earnestly for healing and felt impressed to throw the case in the fire. This she did, and retired, placing her arm on the pillow as usual. When she awoke in the morning, the pain had ceased, and the wrist was straight and strong. She went to the breakfast table, and at once was able to lift and pass a large plate of bread and other dishes without any difficulty. A few days afterwards she screwed the top on a fruit jar, using this hand, and screwed it so tightly that a strong

laboring man had great difficulty in opening it. Her brother, Mr. Pease, a reliable Christian gentleman of some fifty years of age, said to the writer, "It is all true, and I tell you when I saw my sister handle that heavy bread plate, you could have knocked me down with a feather."

The most searching scrutiny of the wrist failed to reveal any abnormal feature except the slightest enlargement of one small bone. There was about as much flexibility as is generally found in women of her age. She has never had any of the terrible pain, nor any suggestion of the old conditions in the years that have passed since her healing. No more thoroughly attested case has ever come under the observation of the writer, and the most careful examination and questioning fail to shake the facts as stated.

In reply to the question, "Have you ever, since that healing, been ill, and for such illness sought healing by faith?" Mrs. Church answered, "Yes, but generally I could not get any such radical deliverance. Sometimes I believe I have been restored in answer to prayer, but never just as my wrist was healed."

It is worthy of note that the brother, Mr. Pease, at the time of the above investigation, was suffering from

spinal disease, being encased in a plaster jacket, and walking with crutches. He was diligently seeking healing, and was prayed with by Mrs. Carrie Judd Montgomery and her husband. He was made a special subject of prayer by others also. For a time he seemed to be better, and went so far as to lay aside his crutches and take off the jacket. Still he did not appear strong, and the writer suggested being allowed to examine his back. This Mr. Pease declined to permit, and the matter was not pressed. Evidently he made a heroic struggle to obtain faith, but the disease marched on to a fatal termination within two years.

CONSUMPTION.

MRS. GERTRUDE F. COLE.

In the admirable and absorbingly interesting life of Dr. A. J. Gordon, lately issued from the press of Fleming H. Revell Company, there appears the narrative of the healing of this lady. From overwork at sewing and confinement she was seized with consumption of the most malignant type. Believed to be dying, she abandoned useless remedies, and called in Dr. Gordon, who anointed her and prayed in the name of the Lord

for her recovery. After his departure she continued to sink, until all indications of life seemed to cease. While preparations were being made for her burial, she showed signs of returning animation. Her hemorrhages ceased, a sense of health permeated her lungs, and she was restored. In the fall, when Dr. Gordon returned from the country, he did not recognize her, specially as he had not heard of her healing. She lived many years, married, engaged in Christian work, and finally died from another cause altogether. (See Life of A. J. Gordon, page 147.)

CANCER.

REV. JOSEPH C. YOUNG.

From the same notable book we extract this case. In 1887 Mr. Young noticed a growth on his lip. His physician diagnosed "cancer," and prognosed early fatal termination. He prayed several days, thought of Dr. Gordon, went to see him, was prayed with by the doctor and two brethren. No more pain was felt, and in a few weeks "all signs had disappeared." Mr. Young says, "The promise was believed, the prayer was offered, I was healed." He then adds, "The Spirit

heals according to the will of God, not according to our will." (Page 144.)

NEURALGIA.

DR. A. J. GORDON.

An outline of this case is given because of the character of the man, more than on account of the details or the nature of the disease. Dr. Gordon suffered from periodic attacks of abdominal neuralgia, growing more severe, and with a shortening periodicity. An important work in Chicago was about to be given up, when he was anointed and prayed with for healing. The pain returned with malignant force for a short time, and then utterly ceased, and in four years until his death there was not the slightest return of this malady. (Page 335.)

CANCER.

MRS. IDA W. LOWRIE.

This case is as well vouched for in all its particulars as it is possible for any case to be. The writer is acquainted with the husband of the lady, he having been foreman in a large factory belonging to a particular friend, Mr. John L. Atwater of Chicago. Mr. Lowrie's

testimony to his wife's trouble, the decisions of the several doctors, and the nature and suddenness of her healing is most positive and circumstantial. Mrs. Lowrie's testimony is clear and ready at every point. She was repeatedly examined by able physicians. She was said by them all to have a pronounced case of cancer, and to be open to no treatment save surgical extirpation. Those familar with that terrible malady well know what such a course promised.

For three years from 1891 Mrs. Lowrie's left breast gave her much pain and trouble. Dr. M. G. Pomtius of Canton, Ohio, first diagnosed cancer, and urged an immediate operation. Later, in August, 1892, the examining physician at the great Cook County Hospital, Chicago, made a careful examination, and pronounced the case "alarming." He advised consultation with several other physicians. A week later Dr. Halsted of Chicago made an examination, diagnosed cancer, and ordered an immediate operation, saying, "In three months I would not want to operate on you, and in one year you will be a dead woman if you do not have immediate attention. Remember, you are taking your life in your own hands." Having a horror of surgery, she delayed, and in March, 1893, was again examined

by a physician, Dr. Skiles of the sanitarium at Garfield Park. He advised an operation at once, giving the same opinion as to the nature of the disease. In October, 1893, her old physician from Ohio saw her in Chicago and urged her to see Dr. Bellfield, which she did. He said the breast must be removed at once. But still she feared to have it done, and the Ohio doctor went home and told her friends that it was only a matter of time with her. He also told Mr. Lowrie that Dr. Bellfield agreed with his opinion that it must soon be fatal in any event.

In April, 1894, Mrs. Lowrie began to attend the meetings held by Rev. John A. Dowie in Chicago. Here she was helped spiritually, and confessed her faith in Christ. She did not go into the room set apart for prayer with the sick, and was not anointed by any one, nor specially prayed with. She prayed earnestly herself, and one night was much led out in prayer. Immediately her pain ceased and great peace filled her heart and mind. In the morning the breast was very much improved; all suppuration had ceased; the nipple, which had been inverted, was natural, and the whole appearance had changed. The marvellous improvement progressed rapidly, the breast soon seemed to be

completely restored; and some time after a baby was born and nursed perfectly at this very breast. The picture of the mother and child appeared in Mr. Dowie's paper, *Leaves of Healing*, for Sept. 14, 1894.

In a personal letter from Mrs. Lowrie to Mr. Atwater, intended for the writer of this book, and bearing date May 23, 1897, she says, "I am in excellent health, I weigh one hundred and forty pounds. I don't know what it is to be sick in three years, and have taken no medicine in that time. I have taken the Lord for my healer and keeper and my all. It's wonderful how the Lord answers prayer."

A PHYSICIAN'S HEALING.

FINIS YOAKUM, M. D.

"I am a physician, am forty-four years old, been in the practice of my profession since 1872. I was run over by a drunken man driving furiously in a buggy down Broadway Street, Denver, Col., July 18, 1894, 8 P. M., the shaft striking two inches to left of spine, breaking two ribs, producing internal hemorrhage into the pleural cavity about the heart and left lung, which caused the doctors to take out part of the seventh rib

and cut a hole into the pleural cavity and let out a large quantity of blood. This hole remained open for over four months, discharging foul pus having the odor of rotten eggs. My fever never abated for eight months, nothing lessened it, and sleep was obtained only through opiates. No appetite, no sleep, no ease for the entire eight months. Over twenty-five doctors gave me up to die. I lost one hundred and twenty-five pounds of flesh; I weighed two hundred and twenty-five when I was stricken down, and when I was healed I weighed only one hundred pounds.

"The last days of January, 1895, I applied at 107½ North Main Street, Los Angeles, Cal., to the Christian Alliance, of which Rev. W. C. Stevens is the leader, for anointing in the name of Jesus of Nazareth. Oh how full of pain was this body! And the pain became intense as those saints of God anointed me in the name of the Lord. They prayed for about half an hour; then, in my greatly increased pain, I asked them to help me downstairs. Brother Stevens bade me go in Jesus' name. I went with Dr. Flint, a Presbyterian minister, and another brother's help, down the stairway, resting once or twice, and as I stepped off the flag step, three inches high, to the pavement, every bit of pain

and fever left me, and I have not had any since of the old kind.

"Some one asked me at Long Beach if it was not a gradual healing. I replied that it only took the time between the flagstone and the pavement below; somewhere between the two places the Lord healed me. My good wife asked me when I reached home, 'How do you feel, darling?' I said, 'I am healed,' my first testimony. She looked in amazement. I said, 'Wife, get me a beefsteak as soon as possible, I am so hungry,' the first time in many long months. She hastened, and I ate with a relish. Glory to Jesus!

"I weighed only one hundred pounds, and in just three months, or ninety days, on May 5, 1895, I weighed one hundred and ninety pounds, one pound per day increase. I am well and strong, and now weigh two hundred and twenty-five pounds, am practising my profession, and telling of God's power to heal. Bless His dear name."

In answer to a special note of inquiry sent to a trusted friend in Los Angeles, the writer received a communication under date of April 30, 1897, stating that Dr. Yoakum is a physician of a large practice in that city, and is highly esteemed by the Christian people

associated with him in good works. His office is in the Bradbury Block, Los Angeles.

R. KELSO CARTER'S CASE.

For the sake of perfect honesty, and to help those who have found themselves under similar conditions, a sketch of the writer's experience is here inserted.

The heart disease spoken of at length in "Miracles of Healing"* was of sudden origin, beginning immediately after a severe physical exertion. One moment the writer was a powerful athlete accomplished in all the feats of the gymnasium, and the next moment his heart was regularly omitting every third beat. Thereafter, this intermission occurred after or during any unusual exertion, such as going upstairs, and could not be conquered. For seven years this continued. Then, following a spell of unparalleled weakness and exhaustion, he went to Boston, was prayed with and anointed by Dr. Charles Cullis, returned at once to his work as professor of chemistry at the Pennsylvania Military College, and never thereafter lost a day from work on account of his heart. Many times in the years since then

* Willard Tract Repository, Boston.

(1879) he has submitted to careful examinations by competent physicians, but no heart trouble has ever been detected. Before his healing several good men (including Meigs of Philadelphia and Donaldson of Baltimore) declared his case to be one of dilatation and mitral failure. One physician thought it functional only, but never examined the heart while it was acting badly. In 1888 an attack of malignant malarial fever brought him to the verge of the grave, and for two weeks the daily temperature varied between 102 and 105 with no delirium and no sleep to ease the strain. During that sickness (the only attack of regular disease worth mentioning ever experienced in his life) his physician, Dr. Whitehead of Bordentown, N. J., said to him, "Well, captain, if you ever had anything the matter with your heart, it is certainly all right now. I've been watching it, and it has been as strong as a hammer and as steady as a clock."

Although the immediate heart trouble was thus relieved, a certain mysterious underlying weakness and inability to endure severe exertion was not cured and never has been cured to the present time. For this weakness (where located no one could tell) he was specially prayed with by Dr. Cullis, and afterward by Mr.

Simpson, and then by Mr. Dowie, besides several others, but no definite result could ever be traced. Besides this, special prayer was made for an astigmatized eye, and he regarded it as "potentially healed," but found that the practical answer was withheld in this case also, the eye never recovering normal sight although it did not worry him as it had done for a time.

March 1, 1887, the article appeared in the *Century Magazine*, which is copied in full in this book. That day he was taken with an attack of brain prostration from the long and severe strain of seven years' intense mental work, and suffered greatly for months, while still discharging most of his duties as professor of civil engineering and higher mathematics. During these months a special sea trip to Boston was taken, and Dr. Cullis prayed with him during a week spent in the home on Somerset Street, but it was not till the summer when prayer was made for him at Mountain Lake Park, Md., that much relief was obtained. Then the severest symptoms were certainly relieved, and he was able to work with more ease.

The following summer the fever referred to was contracted while superintending the erection of some large mills in New Jersey, and during that sickness he was

under the care of a physician and took medicine, feeling perfectly free to do so. As soon as convalescent, however, he went to the Pennsylvania mountains and stopped all medicines. Recovery was slow; the theory was strong, and he could not see why he should not be restored in answer to the many prayers offered in his behalf. In this faith and in response to invitations to evangelistic fields, he went to work, — two meetings a day, leading singing, playing the organ, etc., — and soon broke down again. But no medicine was thought of.

Two or three years of great trials passed by, and the summer of 1890 found him at Ocean Grove, where, in response to the suggestions of Dr. Barr, he consented to try a little medicine, as he expressed it, "simply to discover if it could be possible that God might choose that means of help." He frequently said he would take any quantity of medicine if only he was convinced God wished him to do so, and as frequently declared that he did not expect the Lord to inform him as to His will in any miraculous way. Finally this thought formed itself in his mind:

"How much showing can I expect God to give me? I have stuck to the theory in the face of life and death, there is no doubt about that. I have proved over and

over my willingness to die in my tracks if that be God's will. But the same old natural results have invariably followed scores of times. May this not indicate that, for some reason known to Him, God wills to treat my case at present on the ordinary natural plane? And if so, may it not be His will to benefit me through medicine? And how can I tell unless I try?"

A long interval of stout adherence to the "Atonement theory" had passed; Mr. Dowie had been met, and the prayer offered to which reference has been made. Six months after things were just the same, and the mental depression of nervous prostration was terrible. At this juncture a visit was made to a medical friend, who suggested that a trial of another school might do good. Purely as an experiment the medicine was taken and forgotten until a week or two later, when the writer waked up to the fact that the awful depression had gone, and a renewed sense of life and vigor that was simply delightful had taken its place. The correct remedy for the neurasthenia had been found, and the result was work and usefulness until the next season showed a record of meetings held and souls converted and saints consecrated to a deeper life, which surpassed any similar time in his experience. *He had a right to praise God*

for sending him to that physician, and he did do so with all his heart. What matters the method? It is God who ordains and directs. He began to see clearly that the Spirit of the Lord works in many ways and must not be limited to any one way.

A thorough rereading of the Scriptures followed, and the conclusions set forth in this little book soon crystallized under the light of the truth. With this came a delightful sense of freedom. The old bondage to a line of theory was broken. He could trust God as well with a physician or a little scientific medicine as without either. He simply looked over and through all agents and means to the one great Creator of all, and recognized that the ordinary is for the ordinary, and the miraculous or extraordinary is for the special and occasional, and that either is always under the Spirit "as He will." This took an immense strain from his mind. He no longer felt called upon to ransack the universe for a reason for any ache or pain that came along. It did not follow that he was a transgressor because he was a sufferer. (He never did accept that in every case.) He remembered Job and Timothy more frequently, and tried to praise God more in suffering instead of only praising Him for deliverance from pain. He paid even more

attention than formerly to hygiene and the laws of health, seeing God in them all, but ceased to expect a positive immunity except as God willed.

Prayer was no less precious, and his belief in "the prayer of faith," instead of being weakened, became vastly stronger. Why? Because a certainty took the place of an uncertainty. Before this, when the sick were anointed and prayer for recovery was offered, the theory compelled the positive expectation of healing. But, as the healing often did not come at all, the result was naturally a state of confusion and uncertainty, not to say doubt. Now, however, this was and is all changed. The sick ask for prayer. The method laid down in James is followed. The symbolic anointing is done in the name of the Lord. The prayer is offered in the same mighty name. The case is committed to God with a feeling of certainty, not as to the immediate result, but as to our part in the matter. All has been done toward God that should be done, and now the matter is in His hands. If it be His will, the sick will certainly recover. If the prayer has been "inwrought," the cure is sure. And, as we only seek the will of God any how, if that will be toward death or continued suffering, we rest in the Lord and His wonderful love. There is no confusion, no perplexity, no doubt.

The writer has been greatly helped through some medicines and by means of some surgery; but in his medical studies and practice he believes in as little as possible, and holds, with all advanced scientific men, that God's natural means of prevention are better than the natural means of cure, yet sees clearly that each has a proper place in the divine economy at the present time.

He believes in genuine truth, no matter where it may be found, and fully recognizes the principle that all truth is never bound up in any one sphere. Why God has ordained or permitted that so very much of simple medical and surgical knowledge should remain unknown to a suffering race for so many centuries, only to burst forth in a perfect avalanche of discovery in the last few decades, he cannot imagine; but he wishes to be not slow to thank God for the flood of light which now is in the world, nor to fail to avail himself of it when needed. The great fact that the divine revelation in all things has chosen to follow a progressive plan stands clearly before him always, and he is content to learn from the lowest source and to sit at the feet of the humblest teacher until he has proved whether more truth can really be obtained. Above all he fears to ever "limit the Holy One of Israel" to any one plan, sect, line,

scheme or method, but seeks rather to secure all that God will give in any way that suits the Giver; and he constantly prays that the Spirit will keep him from the fatal mistake of turning critic in ordinary as to the ways of Providence. He is finally convinced that the food is vastly more important than the shape of the spoon which carries it to the mouth. He is even willing to take the food without any visible spoon at all when occasion appears to require it.

After many years of study, with the aid of scientific friends, and after many experiments, the root cause of the stubborn weakness referred to has been quite positively located in the effects of two or three accidental injuries received in boyhood, causing a permanent irritation to the sympathetic nerve system. The pathology seems quite clear, but the remedy does not. Hence the matter is held before God in prayer, and the assurance is felt that if it be the divine will a cure will be reached in some way. If not, there is abundant grace in the bank of heaven, and the writer thanks God for the possession of a personal check-book. In any case he rejoices in the love of God, and gladly sends out this little book to help those who are struggling in the difficulties through which he has been graciously brought.

CLOSING REMARKS.

The above cases have been selected with the care induced by years of contact with those claiming healing through faith in God, supplemented by medical study (the writer being a physician) and a habit of bringing all evidence down to the most positive tests of nature, witnesses, and the test of endurance. Most of the persons mentioned have been friends of the writer, and the remainder are or were known through trusted acquaintances. The writer has for years spared no pains to come at the most absolute testimony concerning such cases, and in many of the above asked minute and searching questions of competent witnesses, and pressed personal examinations as far as circumstances allowed. All these questions and the names and residences of witnesses are not given, as it needlessly burdens the record and really amounts to nothing to those who do not know any of the people personally. It is fair to say that through his own experience and the close observation of hundreds of others, extending over nearly twenty years, the writer has come to be one of the

hardest to satisfy as to the clear-cut nature of a case of healing. He believes emphatically that God does at times heal the sick as positively as in the cases of Dr. Yoakum or Mrs. Church or Mrs. Lowrie, but he constantly passes over cases of reported healing because they present no really positive evidence that will stand the tests required in a court of law. The moral conviction of the truth of a case is a very different thing from convincing evidence, and nothing but the latter should be offered to the public for the purpose of creating and confirming faith.

It must not be overlooked, however, that evidences of healing are frequently treated with a rigor and severity not exercised towards legal evidence in court. While it is true that no prayer is more common among Christians than the prayer to God to extend mercy and healing to some sick one, yet it is startlingly true that no testimony is treated more coldly and suspiciously than that which declares such prayers to have been answered. Certainly this is an awkward situation for Christians to occupy. It does seem quite absurd to ask God so frequently for a thing and then to doubt every one's word when they say God has given the thing asked for.

The nature of evidence, properly called for in such cases, can be no whit different from that required in the examination of the standard "Evidences of Christianity." And beyond all dispute there exists no stronger testimony to many of the miracles of the Bible than can be easily obtained for special cases of modern healing through faith in God. If it be objected that the Bible miracles often have inspired or divine testimony, it is sufficient to reply that the argument for the very "inspiration" itself rests upon undoubtedly conclusive but rather involved premises; and it is final to say that if we admit God has said certain miracles were performed in the time then past, it is equally certain that He said miracles of healing should be performed, with other miracles, in the time then future. Jesus himself declared, "These signs shall follow them that believe," and also said when speaking of His own works, "Greater works than these shall he do, because I go to my Father." We have therefore the most positive testimony from the Lord that miracles of healing should be wrought and that prayers should be answered as the Lord willed; and these declarations, in the absence of any divine repeal, extend down to the present time.

On the other hand, the miracles of Scripture depend

upon human testimony, and it is hardly necessary, in these days of "criticism," to say that the witnesses have been examined and re-examined, and their testimony rejected by very many thousands, while it is received joyfully by all true Christians. Can we, who receive so much upon the prayerful testimony of a few men dead for eighteen centuries, dare to reject the equally positive testimony of thousands of living witnesses after we have examined it and them fully, simply because we "cannot account for it," or because we "don't believe it"? If we turn from so much testimony to the working truth of the Scripture promises, can we blame the infidel for rejecting our testimony as to Christ and His mission upon earth? If we do not receive the "signs" which Jesus said distinctly should "follow them that believe," can we wonder at the rejection of our testimony concerning Him who said that?

After twenty years of prayerful examination of the subject from every possible standpoint, and after the most varied personal experience in the matter, the writer is of the opinion that the church of Christ runs a terrible risk if she attempts to discourage or to dishonor a simple faith in the present power of the Lord to heal the sick in answer to prayer; and that she cannot

afford to dare improve upon the Scriptural methods and forms laid down for the special offering of that prayer. If the church will only cease to be so easily frightened by the over-strong statements of devoted but mistaken disciples, whose intense and honest zeal spurred by precious and holy personal experiences of God's wondrous mercy and almighty power for the time runs a little ahead of their knowledge, she will discover nothing alarming in a teaching which stands side by side with the saints in all ages on the immutable Word of our God, and sees in the simple provision for the symbolic anointing of the sick and the prayer for healing in the supreme will of the Lord a most blessed proof of the practical and comprehensive love of God, which cares for the body as well as for the soul, and requires and expects us to bring *all* our desires, necessities, conditions, states and thanksgivings to Him who is as interested in the "little" as in the "great."

If we have erred (and we have, have you?) it has been through an intense desire to "possess the land" to the uttermost, and to glorify God most by simply taking the place and every place He has assigned to us. If we have claimed much for the cross of Christ, it has not been too much (hardly is that possible), but it has

merely anticipated the divine plan in the order of the ages. That the Atonement of Christ covers sickness and disease as well as sin, is but to say that the effects are necessarily embraced in the root cause. There was and could be no error there. But to claim that ALL the results of that Atonement are NOW open to the present living Christian is a grave mistake. We cannot err greatly as to the power of the Atonement by the blood of Jesus.

"We challenge earth and heaven
For a sin it cannot cleanse."

But we may err, and have erred, in endeavoring to appropriate at the present time some of the final fruits of that sacrifice.

In recoiling from the edge of presumption, towards which we providentially find ourselves mistakenly pressing, let us not be persuaded to give up one jot or tittle of the blessed gospel of present salvation and present answer to believing prayer. May we, with all who love the Lord in sincerity, hold to "the prayer of faith" as one of the most precious fruits of the Spirit, and never fail to ground all possible results which reach us, according to the sovereign will of God, upon the precious blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who "his

own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree," and who "himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses."

From Calvary's fountain, Lord, I know
The living currents roll,
To wash me whiter than the snow,
And save my sinful soul.

Like him who faint and helpless lay
Beside Bethesda's shore,
I heard the voice of Jesus say,
"Arise, and sin no more."

I've plunged in David's opened fount,
Where free salvation flows;
And sins that I could never count
No judgment record shows.

There everlasting waters spring
For those whom grace has sought;
And there the hallelujahs ring
From all the blood has bought.

The ransomed, white-robed throng can ne'er
Forget that crimson tide;
And seraphs love to linger where
The Lord of glory died.

And when the ages' onward march
Shall sweep from sun to sun,
His praise shall fill the starry arch
As when it first begun.

Titles in This Series

1. The Higher Christian Life; A Bibliographical Overview. Donald W. Dayton, *The American Holiness Movement: A Bibliographical Introduction.* (Wilmore, Ky., 1971) *bound with* David W. Faupel, *The American Pentecostal Movement: A Bibliographical Essay.* (Wilmore, Ky., 1972) *bound with* David D. Bundy, *Keswick: A Bibliographic Introduction to the Higher Life Movements.* (Wilmore, Ky., 1975)

2. *Account of the Union Meeting for the Promotion of Scriptural Holiness, Held at Oxford, August 29 to September 7, 1874.* (Boston, n. d.)

3. Baker, Elizabeth V., and Co-workers, *Chronicles of a Faith Life.*

4. The Work of T. B. Barratt. T. B. Barratt, *In the Days of the Latter Rain.* (London, 1909) *When the Fire Fell and an Outline of My Life,* (Oslo, 1927)

5. Witness to Pentecost: The Life of Frank Bartleman. Frank Bartleman, *From Plow to Pulpit — From Maine to California* (Los Angeles, n. d.), *How Pentecost Came to Los Angeles* (Los An-

geles, 1925), *Around the World by Faith, With Six Weeks in the Holy Land* (Los Angeles, n. d.), *Two Years Mission Work in Europe Just before the World War, 1912-14* (Los Angeles, [1926])

6. Boardman, W. E., *The Higher Christian Life* (Boston, 1858)

7. Girvin, E. A., *Phineas F. Bresee: A Prince In Israel* (Kansas City, Mo., [1916])

8. Brooks, John P., *The Divine Church* (Columbia, Mo., 1891)

9. Russell Kelso Carter on "Faith Healing." R. Kelso Carter, *The Atonement for Sin and Sickness* (Boston, 1884) *"Faith Healing" Reviewed After Twenty Years* (Boston, 1897)

10. Daniels, W. H., *Dr. Cullis and His Work* (Boston, [1885])

11. Holiness Tracts Defending the Ministry of Women. Luther Lee, *"Woman's Right to Preach the Gospel; a Sermon, at the Ordination of Rev. Miss Antoinette L. Brown, at South Butler, Wayne County, N. Y., Sept. 15, 1853"* (Syracuse, 1853) *bound with* B. T. Roberts, *Ordaining Women* (Rochester, 1891) *bound with* Catherine (Mumford) Booth, *"Female Ministry; or, Woman's Right to Preach the Gospel . . ."* (London, n. d.) *bound with* Fannie (McDowell) Hunter, *Women Preachers* (Dallas, 1905)

12. Late Nineteenth Century Revivalist Teachings on the Holy Spirit. D. L. Moody, *Secret Power or the Secret of Success in Christian Life and*

Work (New York, [1881]) *bound with* J. Wilbur Chapman, *Received Ye the Holy Ghost?* (New York, [1894]) *bound with* R. A. Torrey, *The Baptism with the Holy Spirit* (New York, 1895 & 1897)

13. Seven "Jesus Only" Tracts. Andrew D. Urshan, *The Doctrine of the New Birth, or, the Perfect Way to Eternal Life* (Cochrane, Wis., 1921) *bound with* Andrew Urshan, *The Almighty God in the Lord Jesus Christ* (Los Angeles, 1919) *bound with* Frank J. Ewart, *The Revelation of Jesus Christ* (St. Louis, n. d.) *bound with* G. T. Haywood, *The Birth of the Spirit in the Days of the Apostles* (Indianapolis, n. d.) *Divine Names and Titles of Jehovah* (Indianapolis, n. d.) *The Finest of the Wheat* (Indianapolis, n. d.) *The Victim of the Flaming Sword* (Indianapolis, n. d.)

14. Three Early Pentecostal Tracts. D. Wesley Myland, *The Latter Rain Covenant and Pentecostal Power* (Chicago, 1910) *bound with* G. F. Taylor, *The Spirit and the Bride* (n. p., [1907?]) *bound with* B. F. Laurence, *The Apostolic Faith Restored* (St. Louis, 1916)

15. Fairchild, James H., *Oberlin: The Colony and the College, 1833-1883* (Oberlin, 1883)

16. Figgis, John B., *Keswick from Within* (London, [1914])

17. Finney, Charles G., *Lectures to Professing Christians* (New York, 1837)

18. Fleisch, Paul, *Die Moderne Gemeinschaftsbewegung in Deutschland* (Leipzig, 1912)

19. Six Tracts by W. B. Godbey. *Spiritual Gifts and Graces* (Cincinnati, [1895]) *The Return of Jesus* (Cincinnati, [1899?]) *Work of the Holy Spirit* (Louisville, [1902]) *Church—Bride—Kingdom* (Cincinnati, [1905]) *Divine Healing* (Greensboro, [1909]) *Tongue Movement, Satanic* (Zarephath, N. J., 1918)

20. Gordon, Earnest B., *Adoniram Judson Gordon* (New York, [1896])

21. Hills, A. M., *Holiness and Power for the Church and the Ministry* (Cincinnati, [1897])

22. Horner, Ralph C., *From the Altar to the Upper Room* (Toronto, [1891])

23. McDonald, William and John E. Searles, *The Life of Rev. John S. Inskip* (Boston, [1885])

24. LaBerge, Agnes N. O., *What God Hath Wrought* (Chicago, n. d.)

25. Lee, Luther, *Autobiography of the Rev. Luther Lee* (New York, 1882)

26. McLean, A. and J. W. Easton, *Penuel; or, Face to Face with God* (New York, 1869)

27. McPherson, Aimee Semple, *This Is That: Personal Experiences Sermons and Writings* (Los Angeles, [1919])

28. Mahan, Asa, *Out of Darkness into Light* (London, 1877)

29. The Life and Teaching of Carrie Judd Montgomery Carrie Judd Montgomery, *"Under His Wings": The Story of My Life* (Oakland,

[1936]) Carrie F. Judd, *The Prayer of Faith* (New York, 1880)

30. The Devotional Writings of Phoebe Palmer Phoebe Palmer, *The Way of Holiness* (52nd ed., New York, 1867) *Faith and Its Effects* (27th ed., New York, n. d., orig. pub. 1854)

31. Wheatley, Richard, *The Life and Letters of Mrs. Phoebe Palmer* (New York, 1881)

32. Palmer, Phoebe, ed., *Pioneer Experiences* (New York, 1868)

33. Palmer, Phoebe, *The Promise of the Father* (Boston, 1859)

34. Pardington, G. P., *Twenty-five Wonderful Years, 1889-1914: A Popular Sketch of the Christian and Missionary Alliance* (New York, [1914])

35. Parham, Sarah E., *The Life of Charles F. Parham, Founder of the Apostolic Faith Movement* (Joplin, [1930])

36. The Sermons of Charles F. Parham. Charles F. Parham, *A Voice Crying in the Wilderness* (4th ed., Baxter Springs, Kan., 1944, orig. pub. 1902) *The Everlasting Gospel.* (n.p., n.d., orig. pub. 1911)

37. Pierson, Arthur Tappan, *Forward Movements of the Last Half Century* (New York, 1905)

38. *Proceedings of Holiness Conferences, Held at Cincinnati, November 26th, 1877, and at New York, December 17th, 1877* (Philadelphia, 1878)

39. *Record of the Convention for the Promotion of*

Scriptural Holiness Held at Brighton, May 29th, to June 7th, 1875 (Brighton, [1896?])

40. Rees, Seth Cook, *Miracles in the Slums* (Chicago, [1905?])

41. Roberts, B. T., *Why Another Sect* (Rochester, 1879)

42. Shaw, S. B., ed., *Echoes of the General Holiness Assembly* (Chicago, [1901])

43. The Devotional Writings of Robert Pearsall Smith and Hannah Whitall Smith. [R]obert [P]earsall [S]mith, *Holiness Through Faith: Light on the Way of Holiness* (New York, [1870]) [H]annah [W]hitall [S]mith, *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life,* (Boston and Chicago, [1885])

44. [S]mith, [H]annah [W]hitall, *The Unselfishness of God and How I Discovered It* (New York, [1903])

45. Steele, Daniel, *A Substitute for Holiness; or, Antinomianism Revived* (Chicago and Boston, [1899])

46. Tomlinson, A. J., *The Last Great Conflict* (Cleveland, 1913)

47. Upham, Thomas C., *The Life of Faith* (Boston, 1845)

48. Washburn, Josephine M., *History and Reminiscences of the Holiness Church Work in Southern California and Arizona* (South Pasadena, [1912?])

DATE DUE

BT 732.5 .C37 1985

Carter, Russell Kelso, 1849-
1928.

Russell Kelso Carter on
"faith healing"

DEMCO

UNITED THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BT732.5 .C37 1985
Carter, Russe Russell Kelso Carter on "f
3 0645 0007 1442 4